



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 113th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 159

WASHINGTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 2013

No. 130

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 27, 2013.

I hereby appoint the Honorable TED POE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day. We pause in Your presence and ask guidance for the men and women of the people's House.

Enable them, O God, to act on what they believe to be right and true and just, and to do so in ways that show respect for those with whom they disagree.

May their actions in these coming days prove to be of heroic importance and benefit to our Nation and its people.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.

THOMPSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under clause 5(d) of rule XX, the Chair announces to the House that, in light of the resignation of the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ALEXANDER), the whole number of the House is 432.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMA WAR ON COAL

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, while our Nation benefits from great wealth, often we become disconnected from just what it takes to power a great Nation.

Standards of living that many are accustomed to in the developed world—including flipping a switch and having lights turn on, or with the turn of a dial having a machine do household laundry—these things aren't easily accessed by most of the planet.

We've become accustomed to these day-to-day activities; but to have lights and power, America needs both affordable and reliable electricity. The fact is, much of this electricity is generated by coal.

Despite some of the most abundant domestic energy resources, we are in denial. Mr. Speaker, we are in denial of the fact that we must produce energy to actually consume it. This disconnect from reality leaves the world's largest consumer of energy with no plan to power the largest economy in the world.

The EPA's New Source Performance Standard for coal-powered plants is a misguided pursuit that jeopardizes the economic security of our country. It is a direct threat to the American consumer, affordable electricity, and the economic security of Pennsylvanians and the Nation.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

(Ms. SCHAKOWSKY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, we stand here today on the brink of a threatened shutdown of the Federal Government—bad enough—and worse, a refusal to pay the bills of the United States of America. These are completely unnecessary, Republican-manufactured crises.

HAL ROGERS, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, said:

A government shutdown is a political game in which everyone loses.

Karl Rove said:

A shutdown now would have much worse fallout than in 1995. It is an ill-conceived tactic, and Republicans should reject it.

In a moment of clarity, Senator MIKE LEE, one of the Senators holding up the bill in the Senate, said:

Shutdowns are bad; shutdowns are not worth it. This law, ObamaCare, is not worth causing a shutdown over.

This is former-Senator Judd Gregg:

A default would lead to some level of chaos in the debt markets, which would lead to a significant contraction in economic activity, which would lead to job losses, which would

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H5887

lead to higher spending by the Federal Government and lower tax revenues, which would lead to more debt.

Perhaps most important to my Republican colleagues, this is from *The Wall Street Journal*:

Some Republicans think they are sure to hold the House in 2014. The Kamikazes could end up ensuring the return of an all-Democratic rule.

HONORING STAFF SERGEANT TIMOTHY RAYMOND MCGILL

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Staff Sergeant Timothy Raymond McGill, a member of the Rhode Island National Guard who was killed in combat last Saturday while serving as a member of the United States Army's elite Special Forces unit in Afghanistan.

A life-long resident of New Jersey, Sergeant McGill enlisted in the Marine Corps immediately after high school and was still training in boot camp when terrorists struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon on September 11, 2001. After serving in Iraq, he joined the Rhode Island National Guard as an anti-armor specialist and just 2 years ago became a weapons sergeant with the Army Special Forces, the Green Berets.

Americans are blessed to live in a free and democratic society because of the heroic efforts and brave sacrifices of our men and women in uniform and owe an especially profound debt of gratitude to those like Timothy who have made the ultimate sacrifice.

We express our sincere condolences to Timothy's father, Raymond; his mother, Carol; and his two sisters, Megan and Lindsay. I pray that they find some small measure of comfort in knowing that an entire Nation is deeply grateful and shall keep them in our thoughts and prayers.

CONGRATULATING SKILLSUSA MEDAL RECIPIENTS

(Mr. McNERNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize students from my district who demonstrated excellence in technical, academic, and employability skills at the SkillsUSA National Leadership and Skills Conference held this past June in Kansas City, Missouri.

The SkillsUSA Conference brings together high school students, college students, and teachers with industry experts to participate in contests that demonstrate their abilities in technology, business, criminal justice, culinary arts, and many more fields.

Students from the Weber Institute in Stockton received gold medals for their project in human services, and

students from Bear Creek High School in Stockton, California, received the bronze medal for their project in health services. These students have proven that they will not only be successful in their future careers, but that they will excel and be leaders in their fields.

I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating these young adults on their academic achievements and to recognize the importance of the SkillsUSA Conference.

INSURANCE PREMIUM INCREASES

(Mr. GARCIA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address an impending problem, which is the increase of insurance premiums in south Florida and throughout our country.

The Biggert-Waters Act of 2012 will burden many homeowners with flood insurance increases of up to 25 percent for years to come. Congress must act to reverse these increases and ensure they do not undermine our housing market.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national problem. This act was passed before I came to office, but affects my constituents and the Nation as a whole, and seriously threatens our economic recovery. There is already a bill that can delay these increases and gives us time to work on this problem. Let's act now.

Mr. Speaker, this is neither a Democratic problem nor a Republican problem. This is a national problem. Perhaps if we work on real problems as opposed to ideological problems, we can find the common ground that all Americans wish us to work on.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting our hardworking homeowners by creating a commonsense solution that addresses this crisis.

BUDGETING PRIORITIES

(Mrs. BUSTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the impact of the ongoing budget debates in Washington and how they are affecting the hardworking people that I'm honored to serve in Illinois.

Last November, the people of the 17th District of Illinois elected me because they were sick and tired of the partisan gridlock in Congress. I spent a short time here in Congress working across the aisle to find commonsense solutions to the problems facing our Nation. But too many in Washington have the wrong priorities—putting politics over people. Let me just offer one example.

During the last month, I have visited Head Start programs throughout my district. Head Start, as you may know, provides early childhood education and is an important downpayment on our

region's economic well-being. In fact, for every dollar invested in Head Start, we get a \$7 to \$9 return. But due to shortsighted cuts, needy children and families are being turned away at the door.

In the region I serve, there are literally hundreds of children waiting to be enrolled in Head Start, while dedicated staff members continue to have to cut back. This is unacceptable.

I am willing to work with those who I disagree with and who disagree with me to find reasonable solutions that put people before politics. Let's find solutions that put Americans first.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the Senate amendments is as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013".

SEC. 2. EXTENSIONS OF EXPIRING AUTHORITIES AFFECTING VETERANS AND THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) *EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE MONTHLY ASSISTANCE ALLOWANCE TO VETERANS WITH DISABILITY INVITED BY UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 322(d)(4) of title 38, *United States Code*, is amended by inserting "and \$500,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013".

(2) *TECHNICAL CORRECTION.*—Section 322 of such title is amended by striking "United States Paralympics, Inc.," each place it appears and inserting "United States Olympic Committee".

(b) *EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE ASSISTANCE FOR UNITED STATES OLYMPIC COMMITTEE.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 521A of such title is amended—

(A) in subsection (g), by inserting "and \$2,000,000 for the period beginning October 1, 2013, and ending December 31, 2013" after "2013"; and

(B) in subsection (l), by striking "The Secretary may only provide assistance under this section during fiscal years 2010 through 2013."

and inserting “The Secretary may not provide assistance under this section after December 31, 2013.”.

(2) **TECHNICAL CORRECTION.**—Such section is further amended—

(A) except in subsection (d)(4), by striking “United States Paralympics, Inc.,” each place it appears and inserting “United States Olympic Committee”;

(B) in subsection (d)(4), by striking “United States Paralympics, Inc.” and inserting “United States Olympic Committee”;

(C) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

“(m) **APPLICABILITY TO COMMONWEALTHS AND TERRITORIES OF UNITED STATES.**—The provisions of this section and section 322 of this title shall apply with respect to the following in the same manner and to the same degree as the United States Olympic Committee:

“(1) The American Samoa National Olympic Committee.

“(2) Guam National Olympic Committee.

“(3) Comité Olímpico de Puerto Rico.

“(4) Such entities as the Secretary considers appropriate to represent the interests of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States Virgin Islands under this section and section 322 of this title.”.

(3) **CLERICAL AMENDMENT.**—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 5 of such title is amended by striking the item relating to section 521A and inserting the following new item: “521A. Assistance for United States Olympic Committee.”.

(c) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR COLLECTION OF COPAYMENTS FOR HOSPITAL CARE AND NURSING HOME CARE.**—Section 1710(f)(2)(B) of such title is amended by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”.

(d) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR RECOVERY FROM THIRD PARTIES OF COST OF CARE AND SERVICES FURNISHED TO VETERANS WITH HEALTH-PLAN CONTRACTS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITY.**—Section 1729(a)(2)(E) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(e) **EXTENSIONS OF AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.**—

(1) **HOMELESS VETERANS REINTEGRATION PROGRAMS.**—Section 2021(e)(1)(F) of such title is amended by striking “2013” and inserting “2014”.

(2) **REFERRAL AND COUNSELING SERVICES: VETERANS AT RISK OF HOMELESSNESS WHO ARE TRANSITIONING FROM CERTAIN INSTITUTIONS.**—Section 2023(d) of such title is amended—

(A) by inserting “to enter into a contract” before “to provide”; and

(B) by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”.

(f) **EXTENSION OF PREVIOUSLY FULLY-FUNDED AUTHORITIES AFFECTING HOMELESS VETERANS.**—

(1) **COMPREHENSIVE SERVICE PROGRAMS.**—Section 2013 of such title is amended by striking paragraph (6) and inserting the following new paragraphs:

“(6) \$250,000,000 for fiscal year 2014.

“(7) \$150,000,000 for fiscal year 2015 and each subsequent fiscal year.”.

(2) **FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR SUPPORTIVE SERVICES FOR VERY LOW-INCOME VETERAN FAMILIES IN PERMANENT HOUSING.**—Section 2044(e)(1)(E) of such title is amended by striking “for fiscal year 2013” and inserting “for each of fiscal years 2013 and 2014”.

(3) **GRANT PROGRAM FOR HOMELESS VETERANS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS.**—Section 2061(d)(1) of such title is amended by striking “through 2013” and inserting “through 2014”.

(g) **EXTENSION OF TEMPORARY EXPANSION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR SPECIALLY ADAPTED HOUSING ASSISTANCE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS WITH DISABILITIES CAUSING DIFFICULTY WITH AMBULATING.**—Section 2101(a)(4) of such title is amended—

(1) by striking “The Secretary’s” and inserting “(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary’s”;

(2) in subparagraph (A), as designated by paragraph (1), by striking “September 30, 2013” and inserting “September 30, 2014”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(B) In fiscal year 2014, the Secretary may not approve more than 30 applications for assistance under paragraph (1) for disabled veterans described in paragraph (2)(A)(ii).”.

(h) **EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO CALCULATE NET VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY SECURING DEFAULTED LOAN FOR PURPOSES OF LIQUIDATION.**—Section 3732(c)(11) of such title is amended by striking “October 1, 2013” and inserting “October 1, 2014”.

(i) **EXTENSION OF PILOT PROGRAM ON ASSISTANCE FOR CHILD CARE FOR CERTAIN VETERANS RECEIVING HEALTH CARE.**—Section 205 of the Caregivers and Veterans Omnibus Health Services Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-163; 38 U.S.C. 1710 note) is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), by striking “2-year” and inserting “3-year”; and

(2) in subsection (h), by striking “and 2011” and inserting “and 2014”.

SEC. 3. REAUTHORIZATION OF USE OF NATIONAL DIRECTORY OF NEW HIRES FOR INCOME VERIFICATION PURPOSES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS BENEFITS.

(a) **SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.**—Section 453(j)(11) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 653(j)(11)) is amended by striking subparagraph (G) and inserting the following new subparagraph (G):

“(G) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this paragraph shall be in effect as follows:

“(i) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(ii) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

(b) **SECRETARY OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—Section 5317A of title 38, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following new subsection (d):

“(d) **EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority under this section shall be in effect as follows:

“(1) During the period beginning on December 26, 2007, and ending on November 18, 2011.

“(2) During the period beginning on the date of the enactment of the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013 and ending 180 days after that date.”.

SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE AND RATIFICATION.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—This Act shall take effect on October 1, 2013, except that Section 2 (a) shall take effect on September 30, 2013.

(b) **RATIFICATION.**—If this Act is not enacted on or before September 30, 2013, any actions undertaken by the Department of Veterans Affairs under the authorities extended by this Act during the period beginning on such date and ending on the date of the enactment of this Act shall be deemed ratified.

SEC. 5. SCORING OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) and the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. BROWN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on Senate amendments to H.R. 1412.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendments we are discussing today to H.R. 1412 would extend a number of expiring authorities affecting the daily lives and long-term well-being of our servicemembers, veterans, and their families.

The important initiatives that would be extended through this legislation include those that provide adaptive sports programs and specially adapted housing grants for disabled veterans and supported services—such as housing and employment assistance—for homeless veterans.

The bill would also extend for 1 year the Department’s authority to provide childcare assistance to certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

Further, it would extend VA’s authority to collect copayments for hospital and nursing home care and to recover from third parties the cost of care and services that are furnished to veterans with health plan contracts for nonservice-connected conditions through September 30, 2014.

Needless to say, each of these programs is critical to ensuring the efficient and effective delivery of high-quality health care and benefits to veterans in communities across our country.

The committee will continue to be vigorous in our oversight of each of these programs to ensure the prompt delivery of needed benefits and services to veterans and the appropriate use of taxpayer dollars.

This legislation represents a bipartisan, bicameral effort. I want to express my gratitude to the ranking member, Mr. MICHAUD, and to Ms. BROWN, who is here with us on the floor, the chairman and the ranking member of the Senate Veterans’ Affairs Committee—BERNIE SANDERS of Vermont and RICHARD BURR of North Carolina—for their hard work and their leadership in this effort.

I urge all of my colleagues to join me in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412 and reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 1412, as amended, the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013.

□ 0915

VA would lose the authority to continue a number of critical programs

that, without action, would expire next week. These programs assist our most vulnerable veterans reintegrating back into society and into their communities.

With this legislation, wrap-around services for homeless veterans and their families would be authorized to continue. Services such as counseling, job training, job referrals, financial assistance, case management, housing, and the special needs for the frail, elderly, and seriously mentally ill veterans will continue.

We listened to veterans when they told us that they were busy with jobs, school, and families and, as a result, found it difficult to get the health care they needed without childcare assistance. This measure extended for 1 year VA's authority to provide childcare assistance for certain veterans receiving intensive health care services.

This bill would extend the authority to provide a monthly assistance allowance to veterans with disabilities who are invited by the U.S. Olympic Committee to participate on the U.S. Paralympics team. More than 14,000 veterans with disabilities have benefited from these activities. The results for these veteran athletes have been astonishing both in terms of athletic accomplishment and personal accomplishment.

This bill extends eligibility for specially adapted housing for our most disabled veterans. It would allow them to live more independently in their daily lives.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we have a moral obligation to ensure that we do what needs to be done to help those who have worn the uniform receive the benefits and services they have earned. These extensions of critical programs we are considering today will help us do all we can.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. COFFMAN), a gentleman who has worn the uniform of this country and served this country well.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for working with the members of the House and Senate Veterans Affairs Committees to pass this important legislation.

Specifically, I am happy to see the extension of the Veterans Paralympic program, which reflects my legislation, H.R. 1402, the Veterans Paralympic Act, which passed unanimously out of the Economic Opportunity Subcommittee before being combined in an omnibus bill in the full committee. This program ensures that disabled veterans in local communities throughout the country continue to have opportunities for rehabilitation, stress relief, and higher achievement through adaptive sports.

U.S. Olympic Committee's Paralympics Chief Charlie Huebner testified at a hearing that "participation

in sports and other athletic activities can help speed the rehabilitation process for disabled veterans." As a Marine Corps combat veteran, I couldn't agree more with Mr. Huebner, and I personally understand the importance of rehabilitation opportunities for returning veterans.

Finally, although I fully support the passage of the extenders package, I am disappointed that the substance of H.R. 1412 was not included in this bill. H.R. 1412, the Improving Job Opportunities for Veterans Act, seeks to build on an existing, yet little known and underutilized on-the-job training program that assists veterans by allowing them to use their educational benefits to learn a trade or skill by participation in an approved apprenticeship or on-the-job training program.

Employers in my district have expressed their desire to work with this program and hire more veterans because they know how valuable a veteran can be to their organization. Additionally, Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America has endorsed the legislation by saying, "IAVA stands ready to support and promote innovative ideas like this to end the veterans' unemployment crisis."

It is my understanding that the original provisions of H.R. 1412 were dropped without prejudice and that they will be part of an upcoming negotiation between the House and the Senate. I look forward to seeing the substance of that legislation advance, and I will be working with Chairman MILLER to ensure that happens.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have no more speakers at this time, so we are prepared to close.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1412, as amended. I want to thank Chairman MILLER for working in a very bipartisan way for veterans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I, too, thank my colleague Ms. BROWN from Jacksonville for her hard work on behalf of veterans and her ability to work with us in the committee in a bipartisan fashion.

I once again encourage all Members to support this legislation.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to express my support for the Department of Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act of 2013. This legislation includes the reauthorization of several fundamental programs that serve some of our most vulnerable veterans who are overrepresented in our nation's homeless population. These programs are the Homeless Veterans Reintegration program, the Grant and Per Diem Program for Homeless Veterans with Special Needs program, the Supportive Services for Veterans Families programs, and the Incarcerated Veterans Transition Program.

I believe that Congress and the VA must do what it necessary to end the homeless veterans problem, which is why I introduced H.R.

2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act. In addition to the programs that will be reauthorized in H.R. 1412, H.R. 2485 would reauthorize several other homeless veterans programs, such as the Therapeutic Transitional Housing component to the Compensated Work Therapy Program and the Acquired Property Sales for Homeless Veterans Program. This important legislation has been endorsed by numerous Veteran Service Organizations, including the American Legion, the Military Officers Association of America, the National Coalition for Homeless Veterans, and the Center for American Homeless Veterans. Without Congressional action, we will neglect our nation's heroes by letting these programs expire at the end of this calendar year.

These veterans fought for our country and now it is our time to fight for them. I commend Chairman MILLER and Ranking Member MICHAUD for their leadership on this legislation to reauthorize these programs, and I appreciate their effort to end homelessness among veterans.

With so many men and women returning home and transitioning to civilian life, now is not the time to waiver on our resolve.

I encourage my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 1412, and also join me in supporting H.R. 2485, the Helping Homeless Veterans Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 1412.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2251) to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse", as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 2251

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

["The United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse".]

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

["Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse".]

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, shall be known and designated as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse and Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the 'Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building'."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2251, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 2251, as amended, would designate the United States courthouse and Federal building located at 118 South Mill Street in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and Federal Building.

Judge Devitt attended the University of North Dakota. Early in his career he served as judge on the Minnesota municipal court and as assistant attorney general for Minnesota. During World War II, he was a lieutenant commander in the United States Naval Reserve. Judge Devitt later became a United States Representative from Minnesota. In 1954, Judge Devitt was appointed to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota and served as the chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

I think it is appropriate to honor the work of Judge Devitt by naming this courthouse and Federal building after him. I support passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 2251, which names the Federal building and courthouse in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, after Federal Judge Edward Devitt.

Judge Devitt was a former Member of Congress, World War II veteran, and municipal judge. Judge Devitt received a bachelor of science and law degree from the University of North Dakota in 1932 and 1935, respectively. Upon graduation, Judge Devitt went into private

practice as a lawyer and was later elected as a municipal judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota, becoming one of the youngest judges in the Nation at that time. He then went on to serve as an assistant attorney general for the State of Minnesota in 1939.

During World War II, Judge Devitt served as a lieutenant commander to the Seventh Fleet in U.S. Navy Intelligence. After his World War II service, Judge Devitt successfully won election to the U.S. House of Representatives in the 80th Congress. After serving one term in Congress, Judge Devitt returned to private practice for 1 year before serving as a probate judge in Ramsey County, Minnesota.

Judge Devitt became a U.S. District Judge in the District of Minnesota in 1955 after being nominated by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. After joining the Federal bench, Judge Devitt went on to serve as chief judge from 1959 to 1981.

During his lengthy tenure on the U.S. District Court, he became one of the most respected district court judges in the Nation. His decisions were seldom reversed on appeal. He was known for spearheading efforts to balance the demands of free press access to courts with the needs of courtroom proceedings.

To honor his achievements, we are nominating him for his distinguished service and giving him the Justice Award, which is annually given to a Federal judge who has made significant contributions. Mr. Speaker, to the administration of justice, the advancement of the rule of law, and the improvement of society as a whole.

The designation of the United States courthouse as the Edward J. Devitt Courthouse and Federal Building is yet another fitting tribute, Mr. Speaker, to this judge's outstanding public service career.

I urge my colleagues to approve this important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PETERSON).

Mr. PETERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a great Minnesotan, the Honorable Edward James Devitt, and support my legislation, H.R. 2251.

The Federal court's presence in Fergus Falls continues to be an integral part of our Nation's unwavering principles: providing equal access to justice. The Federal court that resides in the Federal building in Fergus Falls serves the needs of the citizens of west central Minnesota and the surrounding region. It serves a population of over 610,000 people and covers over 25,000 square miles. It serves the cities of Fergus Falls, Moorhead, East Grand Forks, and Bemidji, as well as the Red Lake and White Earth Reservations.

Naming the building the Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse and

Federal Building will give a great honor to distinguished jurist Judge Devitt as a much-deserved recognition.

Before he was judge, he served one term in Congress, as was noted. He was elected in 1946. As a freshman in the 80th Congress, his classmates included John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon. He was also defeated the end of that term by another famous Minnesotan, Eugene McCarthy.

No judge in the recent past is more closely linked to the history of the Fergus Falls courthouse than Judge Devitt. During his many years of service on the Federal bench, he presided over numerous cases in the Fergus Falls courthouse.

Judge Devitt was appointed by President Eisenhower to the U.S. District Court of Minnesota in 1955. Then, in 1959, he was named chief judge for the Minnesota district, where he held that position until 1981. He served on the Federal bench for 38 years.

I would like to submit the following statement for the RECORD, written by Mr. Thomas Boyd, who wrote this brief but detailed biography of the Honorable Edward J. Devitt.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this bill and urge my colleagues to support it as well.

THE HONORABLE EDWARD J. DEVITT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE, FERGUS FALLS, MN

(By Thomas H. Boyd)

The Honorable Edward James Devitt was a proud son of Minnesota, and a man of whom every Minnesotan can be proud. He served his Country during World War II, in the halls of Congress, and as a distinguished member of the United States Courts. He became one of Minnesota's most beloved citizens and one of the great judges in the history of this Country.

Judge Devitt was born in St. Paul, Minnesota, on May 5, 1911. He started off in the Dayton's Bluff neighborhood, where he attended Van Buren Elementary School with Warren Burger and Harry Blackmun. These three giants of the federal judiciary would be lifelong friend.

Judge Devitt came out to Western Minnesota when he was still a youth, attending St. John's College Preparatory School and St. John's University, in Collegeville. He eventually earned his law degree and bachelor's degree—in that order—from the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks.

Judge Devitt developed his life-long passion for people, politics, and the law in greater Minnesota. In 1935, these characteristics led him to run for Municipal Judge in East Grand Forks, Minnesota—a post to which he was elected even before he had actually graduated from law school. Shortly after his election, he was featured by Ripley's Believe It or Not as the youngest judge in the Nation.

He left Minnesota during World War II to serve his Country for more than three years as a Lieutenant Commander in the United States Navy. He saw action in the Pacific Theater with the Seventh Fleet, and he received the Purple Heart for injuries sustained on December 11, 1944 in a Kamikaze attack while on board the USS Caldwell during the Battle of the Philippines.

Following the War, he returned to Minnesota and reentered politics. In 1946, with the help of future Governor Elmer L. Anderson and others, he was elected to represent the Fourth Congressional District in the U.S. House of Representatives.

He went to Washington to serve in the 80th Congress, as part of a star-studded freshman class made up of other World War II veterans, including future presidents John F. Kennedy and Richard M. Nixon—as well as his lifelong friend and fellow St. Paul native, George MacKinnon, who later served as a judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues in the House. While he was clearly a natural and would likely have enjoyed having a long career in Congress, that was not to be. As a Republican, he was fated to vote in favor of the Taft-Hartley Act. This was not a popular vote with the constituents in his largely Democratic and Labor dominated district. He was defeated by Eugene McCarthy in 1948 in what Judge MacKinnon referred to as the “Dewey landslide.”

While this was the end of his Congressional career, it was not the end of his public life—far from it—this was just a detour that would soon lead back to the judiciary.

In 1950, Governor Luther Youngdahl appointed Judge Devitt to the Ramsey County Probate Court. He served well and was subsequently elected by Ramsey County's voters to remain as their probate judge.

Thereafter, in 1954, President Eisenhower appointed him to the United States District Court for the District of Minnesota. Judge Devitt would serve on the federal bench for the next 38 years. During that time, he came to personify the ideal for a federal district judge in this country.

Judge Devitt's reputation and renown as a federal trial judge would grow to legendary status. He handled many of the most notorious criminal cases and many of the most complicated civil cases in the District's history. He also was given more than his share of “special assignments” to handle challenging cases from other jurisdictions.

As part of his judicial duties, Judge Devitt “rode the circuit,” sitting in the federal courthouses located throughout the State. When he would come to Fergus Fall, he always stayed at the River Inn. He greatly enjoyed his associations with the local bar and always looked forward to seeing his many good friends in this part of Minnesota.

On one of those occasions when he sat in greater Minnesota, Judge Devitt arrived in town only to realize he had forgotten to bring his judicial robe. He was saved by the kindness of a local state court judge who gave Judge Devitt one of his—and this particular judge happened to favor blue robes. Judge Devitt loved the blue robe, and he wore proudly many times in the future.

His friend, Chief Justice Burger, said there wasn't “any member of the federal judiciary that would rank higher [than Judge Devitt] in terms of pure professional qualifications and performance.”

In 1959, he succeeded the great Gunnar H. Nordbye to become the Chief Judge of this District. He served in that capacity for 22 years (1959 to 1981). Just as he could fairly be described as the “judge from central casting” in terms of his appearance, he was likewise the ideal chief judge. He was a leader in this District, and throughout the country, pioneering innovations and new methods to enhance the administration of justice in the federal courts.

His treatise on federal jury instructions became the indispensable standard for federal courts around the nation. He was also a leader in introducing the use of six person juries in civil cases, which has now become so common place today.

He served on and chaired numerous important committees for the United States Judicial Conference. The substantive breadth of these assignments reflect the breadth of his great contributions to all aspects of the

workings of the federal judicial branch—spanning from court administration; standards for admission to practice; geographic organization of the courts; continuing education, research, and training programs; and balancing the interests to a fair trial with the freedom of the press.

To say that Judge Devitt was popular among his colleagues on the bench would be a significant understatement. He was a great friend and role model to countless judges, particularly new judges. He regularly taught courses for new judges at the Federal Judicial Center, beginning almost from the time he himself was appointed to the federal bench. And, of course, he published his Ten Commandments for the New Judge which are still gospel today.

Judge Devitt took senior status in 1981, but he continued to serve and work hard. In addition to his caseload in this District, he also continued to receive special assignments to handle significant cases from elsewhere. This work included the assignment to preside in the trial of Walter Leroy Moody, Jr., who was accused of killing federal Judge Robert Vance of the Eleventh Circuit. The prosecutor in this case was future FBI Director, Louis Freeh. The two became close friends and, when Freeh was appointed to the federal bench, Judge Devitt swore him in and later presented Judge Freeh with a blue robe of his own.

While on senior status, he was also appointed to serve on the important United States Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court.

In 1982, West Publishing established the prestigious Devitt Award, which is presented annually to honor a federal judge whose decisions that reflect wisdom, humanity, and a commitment to the rule of law, and whose contributions have improved the administration of justice and enhanced the role of the federal courts in our society. The Devitt Award continues to be presented by the American Judicature Society, and is a most fitting tribute to its namesake whose life and career embodied this criteria so well.

Judge Devitt continued to sit on cases until just very shortly before he passed away on March 2, 1992. The loss of this great man was sincerely felt throughout the Minnesota and the Nation.

Today, Judge Devitt is still revered as the embodiment of the classic and ideal federal district judge. He is also still remembered fondly by so many people who were fortunate enough to have known him and to have been touched by his many kindnesses.

The naming of the United States Courthouse in Fergus Falls would be a most fitting tribute to this great man, and a well-deserved recognition for his extraordinary service and contributions to this State and this Nation.

(Thomas H. Boyd is a Shareholder at Winthrop & Weinstine. He is also a member of the Historical Society of the United States Courts in the Eighth Circuit and currently serves as the President of the Society's District of Minnesota Branch. The Judges of the District of Minnesota greatly appreciate Mr. Boyd preparing this tribute for Judge Devitt.)

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2251, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

□ 0930

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3096

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center” during the period in which the building is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

During the period in which the building referred to in section 1 is occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to that building shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. CARSON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H.R. 3096 would designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center.”

Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick dedicated his 20 years of service with the FBI to protecting our Nation. He demonstrated his dedication to protecting us all from terrorism as he continued to work while fighting pancreatic cancer. Sadly, he passed away in 2011.

I think that it is more than fitting to name the FBI's Terrorist Screening

Center after him. I support the passage of this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of H.R. 3096, which designates the building occupied by the FBI in Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center."

As a former law enforcement officer, I have a special appreciation for Supervisory Special Agent Resnick's 20-year FBI career. His service was highlighted by his role as a senior advisor in the White House, where he had a prominent role in leading the Presidential review of watch-listing policies and procedures in the aftermath of the failed terrorist airplane bombing on December 25, 2009. Special Agent Resnick led the interagency review, which led to significant improvements in how the U.S. Government screens and integrates intelligence on terrorist suspects.

Agent Resnick was a well-respected public servant who passed away in 2011 as a result of pancreatic cancer. This designation is supported by the building owner, and it will stay with the building for as long as the FBI occupies this facility. The name designation of the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center is a very fitting tribute to Supervisory Special Agent Resnick and his exemplary career with the FBI. Agent Resnick will be remembered for his dedication to developing the architecture of a government-wide watch-listing of terrorism suspects, and for his tireless efforts to protect our fellow Americans from terrorism. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3096.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished subcommittee chairman and, of course, my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee, for their wonderful cooperation on this important bill.

By the way, I believe we are going to be joined by Mr. Resnick's widow and daughter very soon. Our colleague Mr. GRIMM is going to be accompanying them here to the House.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, as already indicated, will rename the FBI's Terrorist Screening Center, located in the 11th District of Virginia, in honor of Supervisory Special Agent Michael Resnick, who was instrumental in the creation of this very critical component of our national security network.

I am pleased to sponsor this bill, along with my fellow Virginia colleagues FRANK WOLF and JIM MORAN and with my colleague RICHARD HANNA of New York.

Like so many of the brave men and women throughout our law enforce-

ment community, Mike Resnick was seized by the mission of public service and gave every ounce to ensure the safety of those he was sworn to protect. In his more than 20 years with the Bureau, Mike held numerous tactical and supervisory roles, but his greatest contributions came in the field of counterterrorism at precisely the time we needed it.

Following the attacks of 9/11, Mike Resnick was instrumental in laying the foundational policies and architecture for the screening and watch list system now administered by the interagency Terrorist Screening Center. He was later assigned to the National Security Council, where one of his last assignments was in promoting timely and effective information-sharing among Federal, State and local law enforcement partners. As a former local government leader myself, I can tell you how vital such collaboration is to the safety of our communities. Tragically, Mike Resnick was diagnosed with pancreatic cancer in May of 2010, but he continued to staff his post through the physical and emotional strain of his treatments.

CIA Director John Brennan, who at the time was the Assistant to the President For Homeland Security and Counterterrorism, said that Mike wanted to make sure everything was in order for those who will carry on with his work.

He died on February 2, 2011, at the age of 50.

Mike is survived by his wife, Sarah Chamberlain, and their daughter, Jordan. It was one of my former colleagues, Amo Houghton of New York, who introduced Mike and Sarah by setting them up on a blind date. They were married here in Washington, and they enjoyed tennis, golf and travel when they could find the time. Mike played as hard as he worked. In fact, I'm told he was known to give some of our Republican colleagues a run for their money on the tennis court.

He grew up in Bayside, Wisconsin, where his parents, Sheldon and Ruth, still reside. It will come as no surprise that Mike was an Eagle Scout growing up. He was a graduate of the University of Wisconsin—Madison and of the DePaul University College of Law. Prior to his service with the FBI, he spent a brief period as a prosecutor.

Former FBI Director Robert Mueller said that Mike was not motivated by recognition but by a desire to get the job done, help others and to see those around him succeed.

Though he shied away from the spotlight, renaming the building in which he invested so much of himself offers a fitting recognition and a lasting tribute to the memory of one of our Nation's most dedicated public servants, whom the President characterized as no less than an American hero. I hope we remember that as we debate the issue of a shutdown of the Federal Government. Our Federal Government is filled with such noble public servants who are serving this country.

Let me close by again thanking the chairman and ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and of its Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management, and I urge the passage of this fitting tribute, this legislation, this morning.

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BARLETTA. I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, as a former mayor for 11 years, I had the opportunity to work with some great people in law enforcement, not only in our city government but also those in the FBI, and I know all too well the difficult job that these men and women do to keep us safe, especially Mr. Resnick, who dedicated his life to fighting terrorism. I don't believe we need to look very far to see how vitally important it is as we try to keep Americans safe from terrorism right here at home.

Mr. Resnick not only loved his job, but he loved his country, so I think it is very fitting that we honor all of those unsung heroes who go to work each day, never expecting to see their names in the headlines or in a story. They are the men and women who go to work and make sure that we have the freedoms that we have here in America. Naming a courthouse is not a small thing, and naming a building is not a small thing, nor is just the dedication of a good American who did all he could. Even during illness, even during a time when most would quit and stop, he continued to work because of his love for his family and his country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3096.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. BARLETTA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 40 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 0957

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro

tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on motions to suspend the rules previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Concurring in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1412, by the yeas and nays, and passing H.R. 3096, de novo.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS EXPIRING AUTHORITIES ACT OF 2013

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 1412) to improve and increase the availability of on-job training and apprenticeship programs carried out by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 491]

YEAS—402

Aderholt	Calvert	Cummings
Amash	Camp	Daines
Amodei	Campbell	Davis (CA)
Andrews	Cantor	Davis, Danny
Bachmann	Capito	Davis, Rodney
Bachus	Capps	DeFazio
Barber	Capuano	DeGette
Barletta	Carney	Delaney
Barr	Carson (IN)	DeLauro
Barrow (GA)	Carter	DelBene
Barton	Cartwright	Denham
Bass	Cassidy	Dent
Beatty	Castor (FL)	DeSantis
Becerra	Castro (TX)	DesJarlais
Benish	Chabot	Deutch
Bentivolio	Chaffetz	Diaz-Balart
Bera (CA)	Chu	Doggett
Bilirakis	Cicilline	Doyle
Bishop (GA)	Clarke	Duffy
Bishop (NY)	Cleaver	Duncan (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Clyburn	Duncan (TN)
Black	Coble	Edwards
Blackburn	Coffman	Ellison
Blumenauer	Cohen	Engel
Bonamici	Cole	Enyart
Boustany	Collins (GA)	Eshoo
Brady (PA)	Collins (NY)	Esty
Brady (TX)	Conaway	Farenthold
Braley (IA)	Connolly	Farr
Bridenstine	Cook	Fattah
Brooks (AL)	Cooper	Fincher
Brooks (IN)	Costa	Fitzpatrick
Brown (GA)	Cotton	Fleischmann
Brown (FL)	Courtney	Fleming
Brownley (CA)	Cramer	Flores
Buchanan	Crawford	Forbes
Bucshon	Crenshaw	Fortenberry
Burgess	Crowley	Foster
Bustos	Cuellar	Fox
Butterfield	Culberson	Frankel (FL)

Franks (AZ)	Lowey	Rogers (MI)
Frelinghuysen	Lucas	Rohrabacher
Fudge	Luetkemeyer	Rokita
Gabbard	Lujan Grisham	Rooney
Gallego	(NM)	Ros-Lehtinen
Garamendi	Lummis	Ross
Garcia	Lynch	Rothfus
Gardner	Maffei	Roybal-Allard
Garrett	Maloney,	Royce
Gerlach	Carolyn	Ruiz
Gibbs	Maloney, Sean	Runyan
Gibson	Marchant	Ruppersberger
Gingrey (GA)	Marino	Ryan (OH)
Gohmert	Massie	Ryan (WI)
Goodlatte	Matheson	Salmon
Gosar	Matsui	Sanchez, Linda
Gowdy	McCarthy (CA)	T.
Granger	McCaul	Sanford
Graves (GA)	McClintock	Scalise
Graves (MO)	McCollum	Schakowsky
Grayson	McDermott	Schiff
Green, Al	McGovern	Schneider
Green, Gene	McHenry	Schock
Griffin (AR)	McIntyre	Schrader
Griffith (VA)	McKeon	Schweikert
Grijalva	McKinley	Scott (VA)
Grimm	McMorris	Scott, Austin
Guthrie	Rodgers	Scott, David
Gutiérrez	McNerney	Sensenbrenner
Hahn	Meadows	Serrano
Hanabusa	Meehan	Sessions
Hanna	Meeks	Sewell (AL)
Harper	Meng	Shea-Porter
Harris	Messer	Sherman
Hartzler	Mica	Shimkus
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Simpson
Heck (NV)	Miller (MI)	Sinema
Heck (WA)	Miller, Gary	Sires
Hensarling	Miller, George	Slaughter
Himes	Moore	Smith (MO)
Hinojosa	Moran	Smith (NE)
Holding	Mullin	Smith (NJ)
Holt	Mulvaney	Smith (TX)
Honda	Murphy (FL)	Smith (WA)
Hoyer	Murphy (PA)	Southerland
Hudson	Nadler	Speier
Huelskamp	Napolitano	Stewart
Huffman	Neal	Stivers
Huizenga (MI)	Negrete McLeod	Stockman
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Swalwell (CA)
Hunter	Noem	Takano
Hurt	Nolan	Terry
Israel	Nugent	Thompson (CA)
Issa	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
Jackson Lee	Nunnelee	Thompson (PA)
Jeffries	O'Rourke	Thornberry
Jenkins	Olson	Tiberi
Johnson (OH)	Owens	Tierney
Johnson, E. B.	Palazzo	Tipton
Johnson, Sam	Pallone	Titus
Jones	Pascarella	Tonko
Jordan	Pastor (AZ)	Tsongas
Joyce	Paulsen	Turner
Keating	Payne	Upton
Kelly (IL)	Pearce	Valadao
Kelly (PA)	Pelosi	Van Hollen
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Vargas
Kildee	Perry	Veasey
Kilmer	Peters (CA)	Vela
Kind	Peterson	Velázquez
King (IA)	Petri	Wagner
King (NY)	Pingree (ME)	Walberg
Kingston	Pittenger	Walden
Kinzinger (IL)	Pitts	Walorski
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Walz
Kline	Poe (TX)	Wasserman
Kuster	Polis	Schultz
Labrador	Pompeo	Waxman
LaMalfa	Posey	Weber (TX)
Lamborn	Price (GA)	Webster (FL)
Lance	Price (NC)	Welch
Lankford	Quigley	Wenstrup
Larsen (WA)	Radel	Whitfield
Larson (CT)	Rahall	Williams
Latham	Rangel	Wilson (FL)
Latta	Reed	Wilson (SC)
Lee (CA)	Reichert	Wittman
Levin	Renacci	Womack
Lewis	Ribble	Woodall
Lipinski	Richmond	Yarmuth
LoBiondo	Rigell	Yoder
Loeb	Roby	Yoho
Lofgren	Roe (TN)	Young (FL)
Long	Rogers (AL)	Young (IN)
Lowenthal	Rogers (KY)	

NOT VOTING—29

Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Sanchez, Loretta
Clay	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Conyers	Langevin	Schwartz
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Stutzman
Duckworth	(NM)	Visclosky
Ellmers	McCarthy (NY)	Waters
Hall	Peters (MI)	Watt
Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)	Westmoreland
Higgins	Roskam	Wolf
Horsford	Rush	Young (AK)

□ 1021

Ms. MENG changed her vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. ELLMERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 491, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

MICHAEL D. RESNICK TERRORIST SCREENING CENTER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill (H.R. 3096) to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the “Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center”.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARLETTA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. LAMALFA Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 403, noes 2, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 492]

AYES—403

Aderholt	Bonamici	Carney
Amash	Boustany	Carson (IN)
Amodei	Brady (PA)	Carter
Andrews	Brady (TX)	Cartwright
Bachmann	Braley (IA)	Cassidy
Bachus	Bridenstine	Castor (FL)
Barber	Brooks (AL)	Castro (TX)
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Chabot
Barr	Brown (GA)	Chaffetz
Barrow (GA)	Brown (FL)	Chu
Barton	Brownley (CA)	Cicilline
Bass	Buchanan	Clarke
Beatty	Bucshon	Clay
Becerra	Burgess	Cleaver
Benish	Bustos	Clyburn
Bentivolio	Butterfield	Coble
Bera (CA)	Calvert	Coffman
Bilirakis	Camp	Cohen
Bishop (GA)	Campbell	Cole
Bishop (NY)	Cantor	Collins (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Capito	Collins (NY)
Black	Capps	Conaway
Blackburn	Capuano	Connolly
Blumenauer	Cárdenas	Cook

Cooper
Costa
Cotton
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cumplings
Daines
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Doggett
Doyle
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Edwards
Ellison
Ellmers
Engel
Enyart
Eshoo
Esty
Farenthold
Farr
Fattah
Fincher
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fleming
Flores
Forbes
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia
Gardner
Garrett
Gerlach
Gibbs
Gibson
Gingrey (GA)
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (MO)
Grayson
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffin (AR)
Griffith (VA)
Grijalva
Grimm
Guthrie
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Hanabusa
Hanna
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Heck (NV)
Heck (WA)
Hensarling
Himes
Hinojosa
Holding
Holt
Honda
Hoyer
Hudson
Huelskamp

Huffman
Huizenga (MI)
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurt
Israel
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Jenkins
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kelly (PA)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kinzinger (IL)
Kirkpatrick
Kline
Kuster
Labrador
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Lankford
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
Latta
Lee (CA)
Levin
Lewis
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Lujan, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lummis
Lynch
Maffei
Maloney
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul
McClintock
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Moore
Moran
Mullin
Mulaney
Murphy (FL)
Murphy (PA)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Negrete McLeod

Neugebauer
Noem
Nolan
Nugent
Nunes
Nunnelee
O'Rourke
Olson
Owens
Palazzo
Pallone
Pascarelli
Pastor (AZ)
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmuter
Perry
Peters (CA)
Peterson
Petri
Pingree (ME)
Pittenger
Pitts
Pocan
Poe (TX)
Polis
Pompeo
Posey
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Quigley
Radel
Rahall
Rangel
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Ribble
Richmond
Rigell
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothfus
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruiz
Runyan
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schock
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Southernland
Speier
Stewart
Stivers
Stockman
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Terry
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Van Hollen
Vargas
Veasey

Vela
Velázquez
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walorski
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waxman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup

Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (FL)
Young (IN)

NOES—2

Massie

Sanford

NOT VOTING—26

Conyers
Dingell
Duckworth
Hall
Herrera Beutler
Higgins
Horsford
Kaptur
Langevin

McCarthy (NY)
Messer
Peters (MI)
Rice (SC)
Roskam
Rush
Sanchez, Loretta
Schwartz
Smith (NJ)

Stutzman
Tierney
Visclosky
Waters
Watt
Westmoreland
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1036

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today I was unavoidably detained and missed roll call vote 491, to concur in the Senate Amendment to H.R. 1412, the Veterans Affairs Expiring Authorities Act, and roll call 492, on H.R. 3096, which would designate the FBI Building in Vienna, Virginia, as the Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center. I was hosting a STEM Careers Fair in my congressional district, which was a longtime commitment to the students of Northern Virginia. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both roll call 491 and 492.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call votes 491 and 492, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on both questions.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the majority leader, for purposes of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the coming day and weekend.

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, the Democratic whip, and refer him to the announcement that came out from my office that we intend for the Senate to act on the continuing resolution sometime today and to receive it here in the House either this afternoon or evening.

As per the announcement that we sent out, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour tomorrow on Saturday, at noon for legislative business, and Members are advised that we could vote at any point tomorrow or Sunday until the situation surrounding the CR is resolved.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Would it be safe to tell the Members there will be no votes before 1 o'clock tomorrow, do you think?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman, yes, that would be correct.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman.

Does the gentleman intend to meet on Sunday if we have acted on the CR tomorrow?

Mr. CANTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman about Sunday's schedule, pending action tomorrow, I am hesitant to commit that there would be no votes on Sunday. I do know, Mr. Speaker, that we're dealing with a day of worship for many people, and would work with that fact as well, if that's the purpose of his question.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his response, and I yield back the balance of my time.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN II

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing I know that hardworking taxpayers back home in my district need in these tough economic times, it's certainty. It's tough enough putting food on the table and putting gas in the car without worrying that an out-of-control Federal Government is going to make life harder for you and your family.

That's why last week my colleagues and I in the House passed legislation that provides some of that certainty. We don't want our fellow Americans to see their insurance premiums shoot up or lose their insurance altogether because of the President's unworkable health care law. And we want our government to stay open.

That's what the American people need, and that's what the House has acted to do. Now it's time for the Senate to act as well.

COME TOGETHER TO ACT RESPONSIBLY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there are 435 of us that have been asked by our fellow citizens to come to Washington, D.C., to have the extraordinary privilege of sitting on this floor and making—they hope—responsible decisions for their country.

I regret that the House is not full at this point in time.

I have a reputation for working across the aisle. I cherish that reputation because I believe that all of us have been given an honor, and each of us ought to respect that.

Mr. Speaker, we are days away from shutting down the government. We are a few more days from defaulting on the

credit of the United States of America. I believe there are a small number of this House who are holding us captive and rendering, apparently, this House unable to reach compromise. The American people surely will not reward any one of us.

There is, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, a working majority for responsibility in this House. I choose to believe that, I do believe it, and I pray that it is the case. And I ask my colleagues to come together on behalf of the American people and our great country to act responsibly.

□ 1045

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOYCE). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

UNITED NATIONS ARMS TRADE TREATY

(Mr. BENISHEK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BENISHEK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the United Nations Arms Trade Treaty. Secretary of State John Kerry signed this treaty on behalf of the Obama administration this past Wednesday.

While I support keeping dangerous weapons out of the hands of international terrorists and bad actors, I believe that this treaty represents a significant threat to our Second Amendment rights.

The State Department itself has acknowledged that this treaty is "ambiguous" and that any potential obligations imposed by the treaty are difficult to predict. In addition, once ratified, it will be possible to amend this treaty with the support of just 75 percent of the signing members, potentially locking the United States into more restrictions down the road.

Like many people from my district, I grew up around firearms, and I'm a life-long gun owner. The responsible use of guns for sport and hunting is a way of life in northern Michigan, and I do not want to see this way of life or our Second Amendment rights be threatened by a poorly thought out United Nations agreement.

I urge my colleagues in the House to oppose this treaty and join me in standing up for the millions of law-abiding gun owners in America.

CLIMATE CHANGE

(Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a member of the Safe Climate Caucus.

How much longer will the Republicans deny the science of climate change? Today, the world's leading climate change scientists say that it is extremely likely that human influence has been the dominant cause of climate change. In fact, just reading last night in the BBC, there's an article about a U.N. report that finds that, with 95 percent certainty, mankind has contributed mightily to climate change.

Last week, scientists from Stanford and Purdue Universities found that the eastern and central United States will likely see more severe weather by the middle of this century due to climate change. Despite this overwhelming evidence, Republicans proudly proclaim themselves as science deniers. When will my colleagues take their heads out of the sand and work with Democrats to preserve our climate and economy for the future?

WORLD TOURISM DAY

(Ms. TITUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize World Tourism Day.

This year's theme is "Tourism and Water: Protecting Our Common Future," and I join with the Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority in celebrating this theme.

For southern Nevada, this combines two of our most prized resources, tourism and water. Last year, nearly 40 million visitors came to Las Vegas. We hosted over 21,000 conventions and meetings, which brought in some 5 million national and international visitors, most of whom spent time in District One.

To continue successfully attracting and serving tourists and residents in the middle of the desert, southern Nevada has learned to be especially conscientious about water usage. In Las Vegas, we've found efficient ways to maximize our water usage to enhance the experience of visitors while safeguarding this critical resource for the long term.

Every day, tens of thousands of tourists pass by to take in the majestic beauty of the fountains at the Bellagio, not realizing that they come from recycled water. There is also CityCenter, a resort destination located on the Strip which is the world's largest environmentally sustainable, mixed-use, new construction development to receive LEED certification. Every year, CityCenter saves nearly 50 million gallons of water and, as a tribute to its commitment to sustainability, proudly displays an art exhibit of the Colorado River.

Tourism and Water, it's a great theme. Come and experience it for yourself only in District One.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. MARINO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, House Republicans remain committed to defunding, delaying, and dismantling the President's unworkable health care law; and our mission becomes more critical with each passing day.

We've already begun to see premiums go up for hardworking Americans all across the country. This is a bad law that will limit choices in health care and kill American jobs.

The House has passed legislation that would defund ObamaCare, rein in government spending, and prevent a government shutdown. That law is now in the hands of the Senate. The Senate must now give the American people what they deserve—an honest, transparent debate.

As this debate progresses, the American people will know who stands with them in opposition to this disastrous health care law. The House is leading the fight to control spending, stop ObamaCare, and protect hardworking Americans. It is time for the Senate to join us as well.

STOPPING OBAMACARE AND PREVENTING SHUTDOWN

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I are well aware of how important the next few days are for this country and for the work to be done in this House. We in the House have done our job however. We have acted to control reckless spending, dismantle the President's unworkable health care law, and keep our government open. Now our House-passed bill is in the hands of the United States Senate, and we hope they will listen to the will of the people as we in the House have done.

The ObamaCare health care takeover is a bad law, it's harmful, and it must be stopped. The American people, having had a chance themselves to read it a little bit—unlike what happened in this House just a few short years ago—they do not want it.

We are already beginning to see how it's making insurance premiums go up all over the country—on the average, 99 percent for men, 62 percent for women, and the report just came out yesterday. It's unworkable. It's unaffordable.

We need to get rid of this law, and we need to keep our government open, as Republicans have work to do. It's time for the Senate to act and protect the needs of the American people.

HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, each year, from September 15 through October 15, we celebrate Hispanic Heritage Month, when we honor the contributions that Latinos have made throughout the communities in our Nation.

The Hispanic community embodies the idea that if you work hard, play by the rules and dream big, there is no limit to what you can achieve; after all, that is the American Dream. And achieve is exactly what we have done throughout our history. From serving in our military, to running 3.1 million Hispanic-owned businesses, the Hispanic community is an important part of moving our country forward.

We also know that to keep our country competitive, we must finally fix a broken immigration system. We believe that it is past time to offer hard-working Americans a pathway to citizenship. The future of our Nation depends largely on the future of all of our communities. Together, we keep fighting to give the next generation a meaningful shot at the American Dream. That dream is what we celebrate this month in Hispanic Heritage Month.

My mother used to say common sense tells us that we ought to always put our country before our politics.

THE PRESIDENT'S LAW DISCRIMINATES

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act is here to stay, saith the President. But his legacy landmark law discriminates.

The President has arbitrarily granted extensions to Big Business, to some small businesses, and some State exchanges, but ordinary Americans—no extensions for them. I guess special interest groups just have more clout with the President than normal people do. Too bad. Everyone should be treated alike. Postpone ObamaCare for everybody for 1 year. Don't discriminate.

The second place the President's wonder law discriminates is who is subject to this law of the land. The President touts his law as good for America. But why has he granted over 1,200 waivers for special groups—waivers to labor unions, for example? That's not fair—waivers for some, but not for others.

So delay ObamaCare for at least a year for all Americans and either grant waivers for all Americans or put those 1,200 groups back into this bill. It's unconstitutional for the constitutional law professor to wave his wand of exemptions and delay for some but not for others. That's just not fair.

And that's just the way it is.

WHY CAN'T HHS BE HONEST WITH U.S. CONGRESS?

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, while the President was again defending his health care law, the Department of Health and Human Services announced even more delays. This train wreck of a health care law is quickly derailing, but the President continues to provide delays and exemptions for everyone except ordinary Americans.

After the President and the administration promised time and time again that the exchanges would be ready and online October 1, several States have said consumers are actually just going to have to wait. Maybe you can send in a paper application if you're anxious.

Last week, on September 19, I asked the director of the agency charged with implementing the exchanges: Will the enrollment process be ready October 1 of this year? I actually posed that as a yes or no question. His answer: Consumers will be able to go online, they will be able to get a determination of what tax subsidies they are eligible for, they will be able to look at the plans that are available where they live, they will be able to see the premium net of subsidy that they would have to pay, and they will be able to choose a plan and get enrolled. Hardly a yes or no answer to a yes or no question. But nevertheless, yesterday's actions by HHS bespeak what really is the case. His answer should have been: No, they will not be ready.

GET IRS AWAY FROM HEALTH CARE

(Mr. MARCHANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARCHANT. Mr. Speaker, a report released yesterday from the Treasury Inspector General shows that the IRS failed to track \$67 million spent in the implementation of ObamaCare so far. This is before the health exchanges are even opened. My constituents, like myself, are concerned that this type of waste is what happens when Washington takes over health care.

The IRS has consistently demonstrated its inability to function as a responsible agency. Despite the scandals and blatant mismanagement by the IRS, the agency is also at the forefront of running our health care system.

The IRS has little credibility with the American taxpayers right now. The agency must significantly be reformed before we should let them anywhere near our health care system.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in repealing ObamaCare and getting the IRS completely away from our health care.

□ 1100

CELEBRATION OF THE CAREER OF DR. LEVI WATKINS, JR.

(Mr. CUMMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Dr. Levi Watkins, a pioneer in the medical field and civil rights movement.

After four decades with Johns Hopkins Medicine, Dr. Watkins will retire on December 31, 2013. He is a man of many firsts. He was the first African American to attend and graduate from Vanderbilt Medical School.

His first scientific breakthrough was his research into the connection between the renin angiotensin system and congestive heart failure that led to the use of angiotensin blockers in the treatment of heart failure. He also performed the first implantation of the automatic implantable defibrillator in the human heart.

Dr. Watkins fought for African Americans' civil rights in the 1950s and fought for equal opportunities in education throughout his career, increasing minority enrollment at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine by 400 percent in 4 years.

I thank Dr. Watkins for all that he has done for our Nation and for the legacy he leaves to inspire generations yet unborn.

RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS

(Mr. TIPTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I believe the sense of this House—and certainly the American people—is that the Constitution of the United States is worthy of protecting, and the rights that are afforded in that Constitution are worthy of protecting.

Unfortunately, the administration has unilaterally decided to try and obligate citizens of the United States to the UN's mandates when it comes to the small arms treaty affecting the Second Amendment rights of every American. I believe that we should not be held accountable, we should not be held in submission to the whims of an unelected organization on the world stage.

The value of our Constitution, the value of our rights must be protected. We must urge the United States Senate to reject the treaty that Secretary Kerry has just signed. Stand up for the rights of Americans, stand up for the rights of Americans to be able to keep and bear arms, and protect the Second Amendment of the United States.

OBAMACARE

(Mrs. BACHMANN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that the President's health care plan is completely unworkable. Not only is it unworkable, it is unfair to nearly everyone in the United States—businessperson and individual alike.

Hardworking Americans know it because their premiums are skyrocketing and, even worse, they are getting notices in the mail that they are being told that their health insurance is being pulled altogether.

Small businesses know it. They are having to respond by not hiring the people they want to hire—in some cases, even having to fire—or reducing the amount of hours to below 30 hours a week.

People in the President's own party know it. The gentleman that wrote this bill called the bill a nightmare. Even the labor unions that support the President know this. They have called this bill a nightmare, and they've said it is breaking the back on the American Dream, breaking the back on the 40-hour workweek and on health care benefits.

Even the President knows it. He has admitted, despite saying the law is working just as it is supposed to, the President just once again had to have yet one more delay in ObamaCare—in fact, over 19 times.

That is why we are asking, Mr. Speaker, for fairness in a workable health care law.

SPENDING BILL

(Mr. BLUMENAUER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting listening to the parade of horrors recounted on the floor of the House today; but as a practical matter, in States like mine, in Oregon, people are going to get better coverage at lower costs—and California, New York, and Colorado, where people are actually working to implement the law rather than sabotage it.

But this is a smokescreen. Obscuring the fact that when my Republican friends talk, for example, about spending in debt, they are actually afraid to allow the House of Representatives to vote on their own spending bill because their own Members won't vote for it. That is why it has been 2 months and we have never finished deliberation on the Transportation bill. They pulled the Interior bill all together. They even refused to allow to have a conference committee formed to reconcile the differences between the House and the Senate.

It is a sad chapter when the fractured Republicans stand around when Americans deserve better. There is no reason the Senate could not have its bill before us today and the House Republican leadership bring us back into session. Instead, we are going to stall and stumble all we can up to the brink.

SENATE NEEDS TO DO THEIR JOB

(Mr. CULBERSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Oregon is correct. It is important that the Congress get our work done on making sure that our military is fully funded and paid, that our veterans, the military construction, the bases around the world are taken care of, that Homeland Security is taken care of. But we have done that. It has already been done in the House.

The Senate has had our Homeland Security appropriations bills for over 3 months. The Senate has had possession of a military construction and veterans appropriations bill for over 3 months. The Senate has also had the Department of Defense appropriations bill for over 3 months. Yet they have irresponsibly chosen to just sit on them to set them up for this moment, because they know that House Republicans are devoted to delaying and defunding ObamaCare, one of the most destructive pieces of legislation ever passed by Congress that will destroy jobs and cripple this economy and socialize the greatest health care system the world has ever created.

We are committed as constitutional conservatives to doing everything in our power to make sure that we delay and defund ObamaCare. But at the same time, we have already done our job in making sure that our military—our men and women in uniform—have everything they need if the Senate will only do their job.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. PITTENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the false promises of ObamaCare are now coming to light. The President promised a \$2,500 reduction in premiums. Well, the average now is \$3,000.

I get countless calls every day and emails from my constituents about the increase in their premiums. One emailed me today that his increase was 200 percent. An \$11,000 deductible cost him \$1,100 a month. That is intolerable. Mr. Speaker, we have to address this today.

Another one called and said: ROBERT, it's gone up 250 percent on my premiums. This is wrong. We were promised jobs. Speaker PELOSI said: Well, we are going to have 4 million new jobs, 400,000 almost immediately.

Well, what's happened?

Seventy-one percent of all the new businesses, they're not hiring today. They're certainly not hiring full-time people. We lost 250,000 full-time jobs just in the month of June. It's killing jobs in this country.

It's a false promise on keeping your own health care plan. Seven million

new people now cannot keep the health care plan that they were promised.

Mr. Speaker, it's time we address this today and relieve the American people from ObamaCare.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GOHMERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was sitting back here when a Democratic leader came to that microphone and with indignation in his voice demanded the Republicans act responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask you: Was it responsible for the Democratic Party, when they had Republicans willing to say, yeah, we will agree to a bill that let's 26-year-olds be on their insurance with their parents, we will agree to work something out so insurance companies can't abuse people with pre-existing conditions—they didn't want our help. They said, We don't need your vote. They didn't get one because they didn't want it.

They took a massive—my copy was about 2,500 pages, rammed it down America's throats without even having them stick out their tongue and say, "Ahh." This is irresponsible.

We are the ones that are acting responsibly and trying to mitigate the damage they've done to the American people—their health care they've lost they didn't get to keep, their doctors they've lost they didn't get to keep, and now the economy that's been devastated.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. GARRETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, your privacy is under attack. The Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, is creating a data hub for every American's personal health information and financial information. It's basically a central location for all of America, for all of your private and sensitive information.

Can America really trust this system that has key information on your income, your Social Security numbers, your emails, your family size, your medical records, and the list goes on? The answer is "no."

With the ObamaCare data hub, an American's personal information will be shared from the Department of Justice, the Social Security Administration, the Department of Homeland Security. The IRS will send information, the Treasury Department, Health and Human Services.

We have already witnessed many security breaches within numerous government agencies, and the potential for abuse here is staggering. We know a system like this will be attractive to identity thieves. It is clear that a system that has not been tested for security systems cannot adequately protect all of our security information and our

personal information. We have even witnessed privacy abuses by other government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS.

The Obama data hub will end privacy as we know it and will grant unprecedented power over citizens to the government.

NATIONAL PUBLIC LAND DAY

(Mr. BISHOP of Utah asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is the 20th anniversary of National Public Land Day. Whoopee.

I am also reading a book about the members of my church trying to live in post-World War II East Germany where all building was restricted. If they wished to have a house in which to worship and it was on government land, the government always owned the building and could possess it at any time. If they actually wished to possess the building, they had to find private land to trade to the government because the official policy of East Germany was “no net loss of federal land.”

I mention that because communist East Germany has the same policy standard as the Department of the Interior and Forest Service have today.

Mr. Speaker, either we are wrong or East Germany was right, and I sincerely doubt the latter is accurate.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, since ObamaCare was first passed, we've known that it would cause premiums to rise and increase the cost of health insurance for millions of Americans.

One issue that has not been talked about enough is the serious threat to the access of quality care for patients, especially in the rural parts of the country that I represent. This is a very serious issue in my district, and one of the main reasons that I support defunding this bill.

As we get closer to the October 1 release date of the individual health insurance plans under ObamaCare, the threat of reduced access is quickly becoming the reality. Because of ObamaCare, one of the largest health insurers in Georgia is eliminating 40 percent of their contracts with hospitals and 30 percent of the contracts with doctors in the State and ending all voluntary out-of-State coverage.

For my constituents in rural Georgia, we already face a shortage of care. In small rural communities, working-class patients have a more difficult time accessing the hospital or doctor that they may need.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues and the American people to look at the facts and ask: What good is a health in-

surance card when a patient cannot find a doctor or hospital that takes it? That's one of the reasons that I stand before you in strong support of defunding this destructive law and putting in place commonsense, market-based reforms.

OBAMACARE

(Mr. KING of Iowa asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor, as many of us do, to speak about the intrusion into a God-given American freedom called ObamaCare.

As I watched the debate go back and forth and listened to my junior Senator declare those of us who don't want to fund ObamaCare to be for anarchy, I would say instead it's this: that if ObamaCare is ever implemented and enforced, we will never recover from it. It is an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty.

What we are saying here in the House is we are not going to fund any implementation or enforcement of ObamaCare. If that means that the President would shut the government down in his throwing of a political tantrum, that's not on us; that's on him.

We have always recovered from government shutdowns. There were 57 days of government shutdowns under Jimmy Carter. We don't even remember that.

We will never recover from ObamaCare if it's implemented, and I'm going to stand in opposition to funding ObamaCare.

□ 1115

OBAMACARE: A BUDGET ISSUE

(Mr. WOODALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the Budget Committee. Yesterday, we had a hearing with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office. That's the nonpartisan group that does the scoring and that talks about what the impact of the decisions we make here will have on Americans, on taxpayers, on future generations.

We all know that the largest costs we have in the Federal budget are driven by health care. That's why we are focused so much on bringing health care costs down. In the midst of that, we are developing an entirely new Federal health care benefit in this country, and the Congressional Budget Office, Mr. Speaker, said this: that of all the Federal health care costs that will be paid over the next 10 years, more than half will be brand new costs from ObamaCare.

This is already the biggest expense we have, and we are going to double it. That's why this is a budget issue. That's why we are talking about it in the time of funding the government and funding the national debt.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will bankrupt us. We must take care of families in our districts. We must address pre-existing conditions. We must cover children—but we must do it in a way that does not bankrupt America.

GET 'ER DONE

(Mr. DENT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the American people sent us here to govern. Now is the time to govern. In a few short days, the government will shut down unless the House acts.

I oppose ObamaCare, and I oppose shutting down the government. We had a vote in the House. The Senate will soon have a vote. They will, in all likelihood, strip out the “defund ObamaCare” language and send us back a bill.

I believe it is time for us to stop playing political games. I believe it is time for us in a bipartisan manner to vote to fund the government and end this brinksmanship debacle that has been going on for the past few days. I feel very strongly about this. Moreover, the American people expect us to make sure that services are provided. I want to make sure the troops are paid and that the people who are in need of services actually receive them.

There will be more opportunities to debate these issues going forward, particularly as it relates to the debt ceiling, but for now, fund the government, and do it in a bipartisan way.

As they say in Texas, “Get 'er done.”

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. BACHMANN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to stand in the greatest deliberative body in the world and in the well of the House of Representatives. It is especially poignant that we are here today as Members of this body, because we are looking at an historic shift in United States history.

Next week, Mr. Speaker, not one American will escape the new rules and regulatory burden of ObamaCare. We are going to face something that's unprecedented in the history of the country, and we already know what some of those results will be. We have a law that's absolutely unaffordable. Our

President told us that we had to hurry, hurry, hurry—not even take time to read the bill—because we were going to be saving \$2,500 per American household if we passed this bill.

Mr. President, we are already told that the average increase is about \$3,000 per household—well over a \$5,000 difference from what you promised us. It's unaffordable, Mr. President. Now we also know it's completely unworkable. How do we know that? Because, Mr. President, we already know that you have granted 19 different waivers, blockages, repeals of ObamaCare. Even your administration—Mr. Speaker, we would say to the President—has admitted it's completely unworkable.

And it's unfair.

I think this is what galls the American people more than anything. How do we know it's unfair? Take a look at the leader of one of the largest unions in the United States, one of the advocates for the Unaffordable Care Act, as many have called it. James Hoffa, the head of the Teamsters Union, calls ObamaCare a nightmare, and he has begged and pleaded the President of the United States to back off of ObamaCare because he said, in his words, that it is taking away the American Dream—what unions have worked for, to build up a 40-hour workweek. We are now becoming a part-time Nation so that employers today are looking for employees who will work no more than 29-and-a-half hours a week. That's a 25 percent reduction in hours for the average American worker, let alone the multiple tens of thousands of employees who have already been thrown off of their health insurance. That's unfair.

Finally, it's unpopular.

Never has ObamaCare enjoyed any popularity, and the President of the United States promised his side of the aisle, Don't worry. Just pass it.

In other words, build it, and they will come.

The bill was passed, and today—just literally days before this bill goes into effect—it is more unpopular than ever. If we think it's unpopular now, wait until it's fully implemented. As they say, there is nothing more expensive than something that is supposed to be free, and we are going to find out just how expensive that is.

We are going to enjoy for the next hour comments from people within this body as to what they've heard from the folks back home, what real Americans are saying about how this horrific law is going to impact their lives.

I would like to first yield time to the esteemed colleague from the State of North Carolina, the Honorable VIRGINIA FOXX, a leader within this body.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Minnesota for helping to lead this effort today with our other colleague from Tennessee and all of our colleagues who are going to be here today.

I think it's really important that we shed a lot of light on a couple of issues

that are going to be discussed. They were discussed in the 1 minutes this morning, and I want to compliment all of our colleagues who came down to talk about this problem that we are facing with the implementation of this unaffordable, unworkable, unfair, unpopular bill that was passed in an unprecedented way, as you said.

I also think that it's important that we throw light on the issue of what happens if our government is shut down. As our colleague, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, was saying, House Republicans want this government to stay open. We have acted to keep the government open. We don't want a government shutdown. We voted a week ago to pass a continuing resolution in advance of the new fiscal year, which lays out how the government will be funded, how the troops will be paid, how the parks will remain open, and how day-to-day government operations will continue. Yes, we oppose this bill, but we want to keep our government running.

The Democrats in the Senate have yet to pass this legislation to protect the American people from a shutdown or from the unfairness of ObamaCare. America is waiting for the Senate. Because the clock is running, the country is nearing the edge of the 18th government shutdown since 1976.

I want to thank our colleague, particularly MICHELE BACHMANN, for calling to our attention the article that ran in *The Washington Post* this week that pointed out the history of government shutdowns. We don't believe in government shutdowns on the Republican side, but contrary to what our colleagues are trying to say and what the President is saying, this is not an issue that has been brought on only by Republicans in the past. Government shutdowns have occurred with Democrats and Republicans in the White House. They have occurred with divided Congresses, with a Congress of one party and a White House of the other. They have even occurred when Democrats have controlled both the Congress and the White House.

We don't want to add another chapter to that history, so we have asked our colleagues in the Senate to do their part. We know that the threat of a shutdown breeds uncertainty and confusion for American families when too many are already concerned about how ObamaCare will be making unwelcome changes to their health care and making health care more expensive, as has been pointed out by several of our colleagues today. So we want the Senate to act, to follow the lead of the House and move the country away from shutdown and away from ObamaCare. By the way, let's point out again that our bill passed with bipartisan support.

The right step to take is to repeal ObamaCare—at the very least to delay ObamaCare—because of the problems that it presents and not shut down the government. That's the message Republicans are bringing. Unfortunately,

it has not been the message that has been out there in the media. I am thankful, again, to my colleagues for being here today and leading this Special Order to make sure that, at least here, we can get that message out.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you to Congresswoman FOXX.

Thank you for your leadership in this area.

It's wonderful, I think, to hear from women, and one woman in particular is the gentlelady from Tennessee, MARSHA BLACKBURN, who has let our Conference know absolutely clearly that 80 percent of all health care decisions in this country are made by women, so women, in particular, are impacted by this decision because they are at the front line of understanding how unaffordable the President's new health care plan is, how unfair it's going to be to themselves, to their families, to their parents that they often care for, how unworkable it is, and how they want to see a positive solution.

We are not here just to beat up. We are here to make sure that we have a positive solution for American families, and it is women whom we are very concerned about today.

So, with that, I would like to yield to the gentlelady from Tennessee, Mrs. MARSHA BLACKBURN.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Thank you so much, and I thank the gentlelady for her attention on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I think each of us wants to thank the leadership for allowing us to have time on the House floor and talk directly to the American people in order to be certain that they know exactly what is in this unaffordable act. We have talked a lot about why we want to delay it and defund it and repeal it and replace it, and the importance of that.

As the gentlelady from Minnesota mentioned, one of the problems that we hear from women is—guess what?—the cost of insurance is going up. The President had said it's going to save you \$2,500, and we are hearing now that it is going to be going up between \$3,000 and \$7,500 per family per year for the cost of insurance. When you look at the cost of these exchanges, they're not saving money; it's costing them more.

We are hearing reports of how out-of-pocket expenses are expected to escalate. It may be \$5,000 or \$6,000 per family. The costs are escalating in what families are going to be using to pay for health care, and because of that, they are looking at us and are saying you have to get the costs down.

There is the impact of ObamaCare on jobs, on the 40-hour workweek, which has been such a cornerstone of the American Dream, such a cornerstone for hardworking families to be able to support their families, to have their children dream big dreams, to educate those children, and to send them forward in the world to do their part in adding to the greatness of America. That is being attacked by this legislation.

It is, indeed, a law that the American people do not want because they can't afford it.

Go back, and remember where we started with this—and this is one thing I hear from women regularly. I had a constituent ask me recently, and it reminded me.

She said, What was the purpose of ObamaCare?

Supposedly, when all of this great debate started, it was to find a pathway for somewhere between 30 and 45 million Americans who did not have access to health insurance to have health insurance. What it has become is a Federalizing and a nationalizing of 17 percent of the U.S. economy. It is turning health care on its head.

In order to pay for it—Mr. WOODALL mentioned the hearing that we had in the Budget Committee yesterday—they have taken money out of Medicare, which is money that our seniors have earned. They've earned that money. They have put it into the Medicare trust fund. ObamaCare pulls it out and puts it over here in the ObamaCare pot—\$600 billion worth. That money was to be there for seniors, for hard-working taxpayers. This administration picks it up, and they move it over.

They are implementing 20 new taxes. Insurance policies, home sales, equity—you name it—medical devices are all subject to a tax. Why? They've got to find a way to pay for this expensive program that no one can afford. All the while, we continue to stay near 8 percent in unemployment. We have millions of Americans—23 million Americans—who are either unemployed or underemployed, and the Federal Government is seeking to take more of their paychecks.

□ 1130

This is one of the reasons that about 130 of our colleagues, including the gentlelady from Minnesota, have joined me on H.R. 2809, which is the legislation that is the 1-year delay of all things ObamaCare—all the taxes, the fees, the penalties, the Medicaid expansion that our States don't want, the exchanges that are not ready to open. Indeed, on the front page of *The Wall Street Journal*, there was another article about another glitch in these exchanges. It's not ready for prime time. The smart thing to do is delay it so that we can defund, repeal it, and replace it.

At our Republican Study Committee, we have introduced great replacement language, the American Health Care Reform Act. I know that others who are waiting to speak are going to talk about this act and the ideas we have to give individuals and patients and moms and dads more control over their health care. That's what we want, individuals able to make their own decisions, not a bunch of bureaucrats sitting in a building down on Independence Avenue in Washington, D.C.

We do not trust those decisions to nameless, faceless, unknown, unac-

countable bureaucrats. Those decisions should be made by patients and doctors. That is what we are fighting for. We are fighting for the future of this Nation. We are fighting to make certain that our children know the America that we have known: the America that is robust and accepting and is welcoming to those that want to dream big dreams, welcoming to our children's ideas and concepts to build companies, to innovate, to create jobs. That is what we come to the floor to fight for. We know an important component of that is to prevent the establishment of this program that is going to be difficult to get off the books.

Ronald Reagan told us regularly that "there is nothing so close to eternal life on Earth as a Federal Government program." If we have to stand here day and night in order to stop this program, let's stop it.

We continue to invite the President with open hands. We invite him to come and meet with us and work with us. We're willing to work with you. Let's delay this. Let's do things right. Let's not force on the American people, force on top of them a program they have repeatedly said, We do not want it; we do not like it; we want it repealed; we want it replaced.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I want to say thank you to the gentlewoman from Tennessee for all her passion and vigor and also for the wonderful piece of legislation because I think it's a good compromise at this point on ObamaCare. And if the truth be told, I think a lot of Democrats secretly hope that the gentlelady's bill passes because they know this is unworkable.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Will the gentlelady yield?

Mrs. BACHMANN. Yes, I will yield to the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. I think we were all encouraged when we had bipartisan agreement and support for delaying both the employer and the individual mandate, a vote that we took a month earlier this year, and we were encouraged with that.

That's such an interesting thing. There has never been Republican support for this law or the 20,000 pages of regulation that is springing up out of this law because it is costing us jobs, it's costing us money, and it's causing our hospitals to close. And we do have bipartisan agreement that the law is not ready for prime time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentlelady.

That's exactly right. That's why I say that I think if the truth be told, a lot of Democrats are secretly hoping that we can get this 1-year delay. That's the minimum compromise that we're looking at, defunding and delaying for at least 1 year. We want to save the American people from the economic misery that's just around the corner.

I yield to the gentleman from the State of Florida, Florida's Third Congressional District, Mr. TED YOHO.

Mr. YOHO. I thank my colleague, the gentlelady from Minnesota, my home State, for putting this together.

Mr. Speaker, when I was a lot younger, I remember watching President Reagan in the debates with Jimmy Carter. President Reagan once said, Now, Jimmy, there you go again. Here we are today, another day, another delay by the administration, another example of why the Affordable Care Act, or as the President likes to talk about ObamaCare, is not ready for prime time.

Mr. Speaker, if fully implemented, this law was predicted to and is crippling our economy; businesses would cut hours, and they are; employees would lose benefits, and they are; and families would be forced into government-run health care exchanges. It was said by the President that if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan. Well, tell that to my constituents who are being told by their insurance companies that due to the Affordable Care Act, ObamaCare, their current plans will not exist in 2014. Just yesterday, we had a Member of this Congress who said that his private plan, which he paid for by himself, was canceled within the last month. I don't believe he feels that he can keep his same insurance nowadays.

With all these delays, even supporters of ObamaCare know and now realize that this law should have been read before it was passed. If we go back to that infamous day, when the then-Speaker at the time said: We have to read it to see what's in it. We have to read it to see how it's going to work—well, that day is here and we see what's in it, and we see how it's not going to work.

Understand, America, that the people that our government has to sign people up on this, they're unskilled in the insurance industry, they're unlicensed, they don't have insurance to cover errors and omissions, they're unbonded; and we are going to give them our private information. I want you to think about that as this law changes and goes into effect.

With your help, we can change it. We changed the dynamics in this Congress on the intervention in Syria. The American people stood up and your Representatives listened to that. We can do it again if you're willing to do that same kind of commitment. We need to get rid of this law, and it's now time for our colleagues in the Senate to act. They need to act in the best interest of America and not for preserving a legacy.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Florida.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT GARRETT. He is another tireless stalwart that, during the time when we were trying to fight, said, This is what's going to happen, is exactly what we're about to see transpire before our face. Mr. SCOTT GARRETT from New Jersey's District Five

made it abundantly clear exactly what was going to happen, in terms of the unpopularity, the unfairness, how unaffordable it's going to be and how unworkable.

Mr. GARRETT. I thank the gentlelady.

I guess I will be speaking for a minute or two on the issue of unworkability of what's before us right now.

Mr. Speaker, I have to remind all of us here that for years now Republicans have come to this floor with one main point when it comes to health care: that it is our goal, it is our desire, it is our effort to make sure that Americans can have affordable health care coverage and health care delivery in this country. To that end—I'm not going to go into all the details now—in this House, Republicans have offered numerous pieces of legislation that would help facilitate that, help Americans be able to get health insurance that they're able to afford, that would provide them and their families the type and quality of health insurance that they need.

We passed bills like that, and we sent those bills over to the Senate where, as I always say, the Senate is where all good bills go to die. Those bills never became law. What, of course, did become law is the Affordable Health Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

I'll speak in just a moment on the issue of its unworkability when it comes to the issue of the data hub. It's not really talked about much, but it is a crucial element if ObamaCare is going to go forward, and it is also one that affects every American's life and their privacy, whether you're in an exchange or not.

Why is that? Because ObamaCare is creating a data hub on every American. It will look at and collect and gather together in one place all of your personal information, all of your personal health information, all of your personal financial information. It will be a central location, if you will, for every American's private and sensitive information that will be right here in Washington, D.C., for the bureaucrats and whoever else may be able to get to it.

Can Americans really trust this system that has key information about your income, about your Social Security number, about your email addresses, about your family, about your family's size, about your medical records, about what you said, how you checked boxes off at the doctor's, your veteran status? The list goes on and on. The answer is an emphatic "no." With the ObamaCare data hub, Americans' personal information will be shared with a myriad of distinct Federal agencies, whether it's over at the Department of Justice, over at Social Security with all of your Social Security information, the Department of Homeland Security, and also with your veteran information down the street at the IRS. We know how secure they are. It will be over at the Treasury Department with all their information; Health and

Human Services with your medical information. It's all going to be sent, come October 1, right here to Washington, D.C., and collected through this central data hub.

As I said, we have already witnessed many security breaches over the years with numerous government agencies, and the potential now is even greater. It's magnified with abuse, and it's staggering. We know in addition, besides the abuses by the people themselves who are going to be operating it is a problem—just look at NSA—but we also know the system will attract outside identity thieves and hackers; and it is clear that the system really doesn't do an adequate job in that regard. The system has not been fully tested for a security system, so therefore, how can it protect Americans' personal records?

To that end, let me just bring up here a little bit of information. A little bit ago, Kay Daly—she is with the Health and Human Services Department—an assistant inspector general, told lawmakers at a House hearing that the system security plan and risk assessment filed way back on July 16 was not made available to the inspector general and to her office, which is for a system that is supposed to be opening up in just a few days.

Former Social Security Administration Commissioner Michael Astrue noted that the review was done back in July and the AG audit was due on August 2. He said:

There must have been a draft at that point.

He also observed the hub's development, until he left office, and testified during that same hearing:

I am just not used to the idea that an inspector general comes in and asks an agency for a thing, and they're told no.

Well, that is the situation here, and that is why many of us have real questions about the security and the testing of it.

Look, we have witnessed privacy abuses by a myriad of government agencies—by the NSA, by the IRS. The list goes on. That same agency that targeted various groups—conservative groups, Christian groups, pro-Israel groups—they will now be the same ones greatly involved in administering this data hub. This ObamaCare data hub will end privacy in this country as we know it, and it will grant unprecedented power over all U.S. citizens by the government and bureaucrats right here in Washington.

The Obama administration has said that they are delaying the employers' responsibility provision of ObamaCare, which is the right and responsible thing to do. They should delay every part of ObamaCare because it is abundantly clear that the responsible thing to do is to stop and delay ObamaCare entirely and stop, most importantly, this unprecedented intrusion into every American's private life.

□ 1145

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. SCOTT

GARRETT. He has given a brilliant case on why ObamaCare enjoys a 57 percent disapproval rate by the American people.

The privacy security breach is one that I think we can't underscore enough. People have been very nervous about disclosures that have come out about our government. They are worried about surveillance. What we would say is, Baby, you ain't seen nothing yet, because we are about to see the largest Federal data hub get underway.

Because what will this contain? Not only every single American's most sensitive, private health information about whether or not you've gone to see a psychiatrist or a counselor or what's happened between you and your doctor—we don't know yet if even chart notes will be a part of this Federal data hub that the doctor writes down about what you told them during the private doctor-patient visit.

We know that somehow this will have to be connected to data that is connected with your employment history—where you've worked, for how long, how much money you make, whether you are full-time, whether you are part-time. This will also somehow have to be connected to your tax returns, your most personal private information that no one is supposed to have access to.

All of that will have to come together, together with your family relationships. If you're married, if you're not married, who it is that's considered a dependent. We have never before seen, in the history of the United States, a conflagration and a centralizing of all of this personal data in one hub.

And how can we, the American people, have any level of assurance that this data will be secured? In my own home State of Minnesota, just in the last several weeks, we had a State Federal employee working in the new ObamaCare health care exchanges hit a button, and just like that, 1,600 Minnesotans' private information, including their Social Security numbers, was sent out in a terrible, flagrant security breach. Not only that, we've found out that the information, when it was sent from the government health insurance site, wasn't even encrypted. It was unsecured. It was on an old-fashioned Excel spreadsheet.

And in my home State of Minnesota, we were, early on, jumping on the bandwagon of supporting ObamaCare. So my State has been fully onboard, working to implement this as one of the earliest States, and this is the lack of security for privacy breaches that we see even in my home State.

That's why we are pleading with the President of the United States: Have mercy. Have feeling for people across America who don't want their security breached, because once it's done, it can't be undone. Once your Social Security number is out there, what do you do? Once people know what your income is, what some of your health

problems have been, what some of your family members' health issues have been, how do you reel that back in? As they say in courtrooms, how do you unring a bell? That's all we are trying to say today, those of us that are on the floor, Republicans. Before it's too late, please, look at these problems that have already happened, Mr. President.

You say you won't negotiate with us? You will negotiate with the President of Iran, who is flagrantly producing a nuclear bomb to use against our ally Israel and against us? You will negotiate with the former head of the KGB and the Soviet Union with the Communist Party, Putin, and you won't negotiate with us?

We are here. It's Friday. It ain't quitting time. We want to talk to you, Mr. President. We are here.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Montana, STEVE DAINES, who is a fabulous new Member of Congress, who has been working tirelessly on behalf of the citizens of Montana to render to them an affordable, popular, fair health insurance system.

With that, I yield to the gentleman who is the at-large Representative of Montana.

Mr. DAINES. I want to thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

In fact, my family roots in Montana began in Minnesota. My great-great-grandmother was in Minnesota. She came from Norway and then pushed westward. I think she heard the skiing was a little better out in Montana and continued westward and homesteaded out there as a widow with seven children, just north of Great Falls, Montana.

Well, every day it seems we hear about yet another aspect of ObamaCare that is getting delayed or exempted or ignored. Two months ago, it was the employer mandate. A few weeks later, it was announced that the administration had delayed a significant consumer protection in the law that limits how much people may have to spend on their own health care.

A Washington Post headline from Monday read, "One week away, ObamaCare's small business insurance exchanges not all ready for launch." And a recent POLITICO story summarizes perfectly what a disaster ObamaCare has become:

The ObamaCare that consumers will finally be able to sign up for next week is a long way from the health plan President Barack Obama first pitched to the Nation.

Millions of low-income Americans won't receive coverage. Many workers at small businesses won't get a choice of insurance plans right away. Large employers won't need to provide insurance for another year. Far more States than expected won't run their own insurance marketplaces. And a growing number of workers won't get to keep their employer-provided coverage.

With key parts of the President's health care overhaul set to start on October 1, one thing is certain to supporters and opponents alike:

ObamaCare is not ready for prime time. Rather than fulfilling the President's promise of, "If you like your coverage, you can keep it," ObamaCare has become a tangled web of broken promises, backroom deals, with no relief for American families and hard-working taxpayers in sight.

This is no more apparent than with the Office of Personnel Management's decision to grant Members of Congress and their staff with a special exemption from a provision in ObamaCare. This decision demonstrates how deeply broken Washington is, and it unmistakably suggests that Congress is focused more on their self-interests than the interests of the American people.

That's why I've signed on to the No Special Deal for D.C. Insiders Act and the James Madison Congressional Accountability Act, both of which would reverse the OPM rule. It's absolutely unacceptable for Washington to impose new burdens and costs upon the American people and then carve out special loopholes for itself.

Until this failed law is fully repealed, Washington must live by the same rules that have been forced upon the American people. This train wreck of a law will raise health care costs, force businesses to close their doors, and hurt Montana's access to quality health care.

In fact, ObamaCare could increase underlying insurance rates by up to 158 percent for the average 27-year-old Montanan and 149 percent for 40-year-old Montanans, according to a recent analysis by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. And in August, the KULR-8 news station in Billings, Montana, reported that, according to a Montana health expert:

It's entirely possible that there will be businesses that go out of business solely because of this law.

I was in Missoula, Montana, this summer, meeting with local business owners who are concerned about how ObamaCare will affect not only their businesses but their employees' benefits and access to affordable care. "We don't know what to do," Opportunities Resources' Carrie Purdy told me. She shared how her employees are at risk of having their health benefits decrease and premiums increase next year, as Opportunities' own projections show an \$800,000 increase in insurance costs for 2014 alone. Unsurprisingly, a recent poll shows that two-thirds of Montanans believe that the President's health care law should either be delayed or stopped altogether.

I was elected to represent the people, the people of Montana. Two-thirds of Montanans say the law should either be delayed or stopped altogether. And that is why I am on the floor here today, because this is the House of the people. We're the voice of the people, and we are standing up against the President's law.

As Montana's sole Member in the House of Representatives, it is my job to ensure the Montana voice is heard,

and Montanans are speaking loud and clear. Mr. President, why don't we allow individuals to opt out for the first year? You cut a deal with businesses to push the mandate out for a year. Let the American people opt out, if they so choose, for their first year. If they like their health care coverage today, let them keep it, as you promised would be the case when you pushed for this law a few years ago.

ObamaCare is deeply flawed. It's a law that hurts Montana, and it must be stopped. And I will continue fighting to repeal it, delay it, take it apart piece by piece so that Montanans never have to face the full consequences of the President's failed health care overhaul.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

We also have ROGER WILLIAMS from Texas' 25th Congressional District.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, pressure is mounting on President Obama and HARRY REID to get rid of ObamaCare. Even Senate Democrats, like JOE MANCHIN, are starting to listen to the people who sent them to Congress. Americans don't want the law, Texans don't want the law, and my district doesn't want the law. And it's easy to see why.

This week, a report by the Manhattan Institute revealed that the President was lying when he said Americans will see a \$2,500 decrease in their premiums. The average health care premium in 2013 for a 27-year-old male was \$91. Under ObamaCare, it's \$139, a 53 percent increase. That's really frightening. This study shows that at least 12 States will see an approximate 100 percent increase in their premiums, many of those far exceeding 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the worst pieces of legislation in my lifetime. It hurts families, it cripples businesses, and it does very little to insure those who are uninsured. We can do better.

The President's so-called signature piece of legislation is crumbling, and it's time for a permanent repeal, for today, tomorrow, and for all generations to follow. In God we trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas' 25th District, Mr. WILLIAMS.

We have, also, Mr. ROTHFUS from Pennsylvania's 12th. Mr. ROTHFUS, thank you for joining us today.

Mr. ROTHFUS. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for yielding and organizing this important discussion.

I have been hearing a lot from the folks back home. Robert from the North Hills of Pittsburgh wrote to us:

When Congress debated the health care law under original objective of health care reform, we thought that meant control and reduction of health care costs. We were wrong.

Stephanie from the North Hills said:

Add us to the statistics of those who can't keep our insurance plans or doctors. Our family is being kicked off our health care plan and is being forced into the exchanges.

Mark from Somerset County said:

Defunding ObamaCare is a great first step. But the next step is total repeal, and I urge

you to work toward that goal at every opportunity.

His premiums are going up 43 percent.

Francis from Beaver County:

My hours were reduced to 29 per week. And now I've been informed by my employer that I can't participate in the corporate health insurance plan because ObamaCare prohibits it.

Paul from Cambria County works in an auto parts store. His annual costs are going up 16 percent.

These problems weren't supposed to happen. The President guaranteed that if you like your health care plan, you can keep it. You know, when you buy a product with a guarantee that doesn't work, you take it back to the store and you get a refund.

The good news is there's a new product that we can shop for. Last week, we introduced the American Health Care Reform Act. It's the new product. This proposal would lower health care costs by allowing Americans to purchase coverage across State lines and enabling small businesses to pool together to increase their buying power. It provides tax fairness for people who purchase their own insurance and provides the same tax benefit as those who get insurance through their employer. It provides tax credits for people who purchase their own insurance.

And, importantly, and if there's one thing that you have to remember, unlike ObamaCare, which penalizes you with taxes, it gives you a tax benefit. You are rewarded if you buy insurance, not penalized.

Also, importantly, the American Health Care Reform Act provides significant funding for State-based high-risk pools, a place where individuals with preexisting conditions can obtain health coverage when doing so would otherwise have been unaffordable. And it does so without increasing costs on those who currently have insurance.

It is time for a new beginning. It's time for bipartisan health care reform and for that discussion to begin. It's time to bring Republicans and Democrats together for real solutions.

As President Kennedy once said:

Let's not seek the Republican answer. Let's not seek the Democrat answer. But let's seek the right answer.

We know that ObamaCare is the wrong answer.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman.

We have with us the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. STEVE SCALISE, from the great State of Louisiana.

Mr. SCALISE. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota for her leadership on claiming this time but also for all she's done to point out—and I think, Mr. Speaker, as every day goes by, more and more Americans are finding out just how devastating the President's health care law is to their families.

The President likes mocking Republicans who have said we want to stand up and find a better way. We don't

think this law is workable. We've had 41 laws, the President has bragged and mocked, 41 laws to repeal or defund portions of the law.

□ 1200

Mr. Speaker, President Obama himself has actually signed seven of those bills into law. President Obama has recognized his bill is so unworkable that he issued 1,400 waivers to his friends who could find access to the White House.

Then he said, okay, the employer mandate's so bad, I'll give a break to big businesses because it's so unworkable.

Then, just a few weeks ago, President Obama himself, Mr. Speaker, said that he was going to actually go and give a big break to insurance companies. But you know who we haven't given a break to yet? American families.

Hardworking American families deserve the same relief from the President's health care law that he has granted, time and time again, to the privileged few who can get access to the White House. That's not how democracy is supposed to work. That's not how health policy is supposed to work.

This law is so unworkable that the heads of labor unions, including James Hoffa, of all people, have said that this bill, the President's health care law, will be a disaster to middle class working families and will destroy the 40-hour work week that's the foundation of our Nation's economy.

We want to give that same break to him. We want to give that same break to all American families, and that's what this fight all about. It's a fight to ensure that government continues to get funded, while also providing the same relief from the President's health care law that he already has said he wants to give, but just to the chosen few who can get access to the White House.

If it's so good for everybody, it should apply to everybody. But if it's so bad, it shouldn't be Swiss cheese holes that you carve out to exempt your friends; it should be an exemption for all American families. That's what we're fighting.

Again, I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota.

Mrs. BACHMANN. That's a wonderful rendition, and I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana.

I now yield to Representative LAMALFA from California's First Congressional District.

Mr. LAMALFA. I greatly appreciate the gentlelady from Minnesota for her efforts here and for the great lady she is.

Mr. Speaker, again, here we are, discussing an issue where this has taken away choices from the American people.

Now, as promised, we saw the President himself say, if you like your health care plan, you'll be able to keep your health care plan, period. No one will take it away.

One of my colleagues on this floor yesterday, counter to that, said how he had had his plan canceled as of the end of this year. People all over this country are now starting to get cancellations on their health care insurance plan that they've chosen with their families, around their kitchen table, probably agonized over how they're deciding to afford it, what level of deductible, what kind of coverage they're going to have. And that's being swept away by what really feels, to a lot of people—a lot of my constituents are telling me it feels like a very oppressive plan that's being pushed upon them.

It's really unbelievable in the United States of America that you can be forced into being a part of this system. It blows my mind that the Supreme Court would agree and rule that people should be forced into purchasing something of this personal choice.

We talked a little bit earlier about how people's privacy is going to be so greatly affected by all this information being dumped into a pool, and government bureaucrats are going to be in charge of that. Look at the leaks we've already seen with other people's information being leaked out by the NSA, or things accidentally put on the Internet by who knows all the different agencies involved.

Yet, this is going to manage one-seventh of our economy, and a very important, very personal thing with people's health and their family's health care. I really, really shudder to think—if this measure cannot be slowed down or stopped by the efforts we're doing in the House and in the next few days around here, it's going to be devastating to people's personal choices, to the economy, to their jobs.

Look at the part-time jobs that are being made out of full-time jobs because people have to react. There are true costs to what the Obama health care takeover is going to do to the people of this country, their families, their livelihood.

So that's why we dig in so hard to do this. This isn't politics for us. No, it isn't. It's about doing the right thing for the American people. A document that really was not well-read or well-vetted, done here just about three or four short years ago here, now is coming home to roost, in its ineptness, in its incompleteness and the overall oppression it's causing for Americans who are feeling that they're out of choices.

In my own home area, for example, people had up to approximately 130 different choices of health care plans through 8 to 10 different providers. They will be limited to two in my part of northern California, with maybe 8 to 10 total plans that they can choose from.

And the way this is rolling out right now, you might get only one plan if you're in certain sectors for perhaps a full year. How is this improving anything?

How is this making health care more affordable, more options, more anything?

We've got to repeal this. But, in the meantime, at the very least, we ask our colleagues in the Senate to not strip out the provision we put in place that would allow for a 1-year delay, which is the least we would need, as a country, to see something made better than what it is right now.

Exemptions, one after the other, are being dropped on us. And why do people that work in the public sector want exemptions if this is such a great plan? Pretty soon there'll be nobody left in it except for the taxpayers themselves.

So I thank you for the time. I thank my colleague, Mrs. BACHMANN, for allowing this time here today. And let's do the right thing here the next few days in this Congress.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative LAMALFA, for all of your hard work on defunding and delaying ObamaCare.

We have next with us Mr. CULBERSON from Texas' Seventh Congressional District, who has been tireless, especially in the area of keeping government fully funded.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CULBERSON).

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, I think it's important for the country to know that the House of Representatives has done its job in passing the most important appropriations bills to make sure that our military is fully funded, that our veterans are taken care of, that the essential functions of Homeland Security are taken care of.

In fact, we passed those bills. The Defense bill out of the House on July 24, the Homeland Security bill was passed on June 6, and the Military Construction and Veterans appropriations bill was passed on June 4. We've also passed out of the House the Energy and Water appropriations bill. And the Senate has been sitting on these bills for over 90 days.

Mr. Speaker, the President has very few responsibilities set out in the Constitution. One of those specific responsibilities is Commander-in-Chief. And it's been reported that the President recently said that the troops in the field might not be paid unless the CR was passed.

Well, the Senate has had these bills for over 90 days. And I think it does not—how does that reflect on the Office of the President, for the Commander-in-Chief to say that the troops are not going to be paid, when, in fact, we've already passed the legislation out of the House—and the Senate's been sitting on it for over 90 days—to make sure the troops are paid?

We, in the House of Representatives, the constitutional conservative majority in the House, are keeping our word to the Nation and to our constituents to do everything in our power to defund, repeal, delay, whatever it takes to stop the most destructive piece of legislation ever passed by this Congress.

And I don't think it should be called ObamaCare. It should be called "DemocratCare" because it was done with 100 percent Democrat support. Not a single Republican voted for it because we recognized the damage it would do to the economy and to our magnificent health care system.

The Democrats passed this bill on their own and, all of a sudden, they're discovering, as the asteroid enters the atmosphere, they've got a big problem because it is causing doctors to leave the profession. It's driving up the cost of health insurance premiums. It's raising deductibles. People are losing their health insurance and being dropped into these nonexistent exchanges.

One other problem that I just discovered and that no one is, I think, aware of yet, are nonprofit organizations who have been lifting people out of homelessness or addiction and giving them job skills and training them, and they find local employers that are willing to take these folks and give them a clean slate, a fresh start, and a new job, and it would wipe out any convictions they've had. They wipe out any history they've got of drug addiction.

These nonprofit organizations have suddenly discovered that the employers are pulling up the drawbridge because, all of a sudden, the employer could be faced with—he's got to decide, as an employer, do I have to provide health care coverage for this, essentially, volunteer, this worker who was previously homeless and had no job skills, and I could be fined for every employee in the company.

So the disasters continue to unfold. It's urgent the House of Representatives—we will all, I know—stand together working and doing everything we can to repeal, delay, defund "DemocratCare," using every legislative tool at our disposal.

I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for the time.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I am extremely grateful to Representative CULBERSON. I know his daughter, Caroline, is the most precious part of his life, as our daughter, Caroline, is as well. And as a gentleman from Texas, I know it's his daughter that he's most concerned about with the ill effects of this bill.

I yield now to another great Texan, RANDY WEBER, from the great State of Texas, from the 22nd District of Texas.

Mr. WEBER. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Speaker, four facts, one question.

Fact 1: ObamaCare passed the House by the House Democrats, 219 of them. Now, 34 Ds joined Republicans in opposition. Let us see how many join on funding the government with the upcoming CR.

Fact 2: Republicans are poised to fund everything in the government at the current levels, and are eager to do so.

Fact 3: Polls show that Americans overwhelmingly do not want ObamaCare.

Fact 4: This House of Representatives is the keeper of the purse, as designed

in the Constitution, and it's well within our authority to defund the ill-conceived and very unpopular government takeover of health care.

Only one question, Mr. Speaker: Will those same Democrats that voted for ObamaCare vote with the American people this time, and will the Senate vote with the American people this time?

I'm RANDY WEBER, and that's the way I see it.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank RANDY WEBER from Texas. Texans have stood up on this issue, and they've been fighting from the very beginning.

But there's also another Member, who's a new Member of Congress, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO. KERRY BENTIVOLIO, from Michigan's 11th District, has diligently worked not only to defund ObamaCare but to delay ObamaCare. He ran on that when he ran for office, and he has fulfilled that promise while he's been a Member of Congress.

I yield to the gentleman from Michigan's 11th District, Mr. KERRY BENTIVOLIO.

Mr. BENTIVOLIO. I thank the gentlelady from Minnesota. That's to defund or delay.

Mr. Speaker, the President's health care law is unworkable. Hardworking Americans know it. They're going to see their insurance premiums skyrocket.

Small business owners know it. They're going to have to scale back hiring, and maybe even let people go.

People in the President's own party know it. Even Senator BAUCUS from Montana, a key author of the legislation, called it a train wreck not long ago.

The unions know it. Teamsters' James Hoffa calls it a nightmare because of the jobs and benefits lost. Why?

Because, despite the President saying the law is working the way it's supposed to, we know it's not working at all. That's why House Republicans remain committed to protecting the American people from this unworkable, unfair law.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank Mr. BENTIVOLIO.

I yield now to SCOTT TIPTON from Colorado's Third Congressional District, a fabulous Member of Congress.

Mr. TIPTON. I thank the gentlelady for her leadership.

Mr. Speaker, the Affordable Care Act missed on its primary goal, addressing affordability and accessibility for the American people.

Probably no one said it better than the AFL-CIO just a few weeks ago, saying that the Affordable Care Act will lead to the destruction of the 40-hour work week, and will devastate the health and well-being of their members.

There was a time in America when we worked to be able to get a 40-hour work week. Now, Americans just want to have a 40-hour work week.

We know there is a problem with the health care law when we're seeing

fewer doctors, fewer nurses, fewer hospital beds, but yet we have the room to be able to create more IRS enforcers.

This is legislation that we're reaching out to the administration to be able to work on. To be able to create affordability and accessibility, we must defund and replace this broken piece of legislation on behalf of the American people.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Representative TIPTON.

From the Rocky Mountains all the way to the great State of New York, I yield to Mr. TOM REED, a fabulous Member of Congress from New York's 22nd Congressional District.

Mr. REED. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

I came here today on the floor of this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and I just dropped the Fair CR. And what the Fair CR says is, let's listen to the American people. Let us delay ObamaCare for at least 1 year.

The President has already given business a pass for 1 year. Why is it fair that individuals and hardworking taxpayers have to be subject to this mandate?

Also, what's fair is, why are there special exemptions for Members of Congress and employees and staffers here in Washington, D.C.? You've got 300 million other Americans that have to be subject to this law.

It's just not right. It's just not fair. It's time to keep the government open but do what's right and listen to the American people and take care of this unfair policy that the administration knows needs to stop.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Representative TOM REED has gone to the heart of this problem, which is the lack of fairness in ObamaCare. And speaking to that is Representative TED POE of the great State of Texas. After myself, my mother's favorite Member of Congress is TED POE, our hero.

I yield to the representative from the great State of Texas (Mr. POE).

Mr. POE of Texas. I thank the gentlewoman, and I thank your mother for being so kind. I appreciate the fact that you're bringing this to the attention of the American public and to Members of Congress again.

The Affordable Care Act, it's not affordable, and it has nothing to do with care. We cannot afford it, and it's the health care of the Nation now turned over to the government.

Are you kidding me?

That's why we are so persistent in trying to change a bad decision by Congress, the Affordable Care Act.

So this morning, I asked people that are on my Facebook to answer this question: How's ObamaCare affecting you and your business?

Share your story with me.

Well, I got a lot of them, and I can't give them all today.

□ 1215

Here's what Stan says:

I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no insurance, as a result of ObamaCare.

Carolyn says:

My husband's insurance increased 162 percent.

The gentlelady from Minnesota knows these are real people. These aren't statistics out there in the fruited plain. These aren't theories by the President. These are real people who are affected by the President's signature legacy nightmare law.

Ray says:

My family didn't get a congressional exemption. Can you get me one?

Ray, good point. Members of Congress ought to be under the same laws as everybody else in the country. Everybody ought to be under ObamaCare. And he brings out a good point. I have here 729 exemptions of the over 1,200 that were granted by the President for waivers of ObamaCare. I would have had all 1,200 but the copy machine ran out of paper so I couldn't print them all.

But here are 729 special folks, special treatment, better deal, because they're not under ObamaCare. They get some kind of waiver for implementation of ObamaCare. And Ray is right: it's just not right. It discriminates against everybody else. This great law gets to apply to everybody except some special folks the President gives waivers to—at least 729.

After Ray's comment about a congressional exemption, I can't get you one, Ray. You need to call the President.

Michael says:

I have to postpone my graduation from the University of Houston because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance.

Tonya says:

My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I'll be able to keep it.

Tonya's tripled.

Pam says:

The huge chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits, all done in anticipation of this new law. Please help.

URGENT: I want to hear from you. How has #Obamacare affected your family or business? Share your story by commenting on this post & #MakeDclisten

Stan: I lost my job and had to take one with lower pay and no ins.

Carolyn: "My husband's insurance increased 162%."

Ray: "My family didn't get a congressional exemption, can you get me one?"

Michael: "I am having to postpone my graduation from UH because I cannot take the courses I need due to having to work to pay for mandatory health insurance."

Tonya: "My families insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep my insurance."

Pam: "THE HUGE chemical company my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, copays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits. All done in anticipation of the implementation of the health

care act the Pres and Dems are forcing on us! He works hard, I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: The University of Texas. More coming out of our pockets for health ins, means less available for college! Please help"

Kristy: "Family business has had a 47% increase in cost to company since Obamacare was passed. Want to provide the same benefits to employees, but the increase amounts to the annual salary of employee. Will have to cut somewhere."

David: "I am a US/Texas citizen, living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a US policy are pay a penalty."

Huckleberry: "I expect my health insurance to double. The provider has extended my renewal date till dec 1st as they are waiting to see what congress is going to do."

Teddy: "My fiancée went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hrs because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from Obamacare. My sister has been told that her test and some of medicines for her MS will not be covered because Obamacare mandates say she is no longer going to be a 'viable' person at the age of 50."

Linda: "I'm feeling the pain of Obamacare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that my insurance company will no longer cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay \$1,080 out of pocket. Asked if this was a result of Obamacare, she replied in the positive."

24 Hour Fitness, Allied Building Inspectors IUOE Local 211 Welfare Fund, Alpha Omega Home Health, LLC, Andersen Corporation, Bowman Sheet Metal Heating & Air-conditioning, Bricklayers Insurance & Welfare Fund, Bridge, Structural, Ornamental & Reinforcing Ironworkers Local Union No. 60*, Carey Johnson Oil Co, Inc, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Albany*, Cement Masons' Local No. 502 Welfare Fund, City of Bloomington VEBA Health Savings Plan*, City of Burnsville*, City of Olathe*, Clausen Miller PC.

Crystal Run Village, Inc*, Delta Apparel, Discovery Benefits*, Dr. Trailer Repair, Inc., Employer-Teamsters Local Nos. 175 & 505 Health and Welfare Fund, Entrust, Fabric-Quilt, GC Harvesting, Inc., Glen Curtis, Inc. #2143, Heritage Christian Services, IBEW Local 3 NYC Electrical Division Health & Welfare Fund, Indiana Area UFCW Union Locals and Retail Food Employers' Health and Welfare Plan.

Ingham County, Innovative Driver Services Company, Integrity Data*, Inter-County Hospitalization Plan, Inc., Jakov P. Dulcich & Sons, Jefferson Rehabilitation Center, JLG Harvesting, Inc., Johnson Machine Works, Kent County, Laborers' District Council of Virginia Health and Welfare Trust Fund, Laborers National Health and Welfare Fund, Local 1245 Health Fund, Local 237 Teamsters Suffolk Regional Off-Track Betting Corp. Health and Welfare Trust Fund.

Local 295 Welfare Fund, Local 381 Group Insurance Fund, Local 805 Welfare Fund, Marble Industry Trust Fund, McGregor Schools ISD #4*, MJ Soffe, MO-Kan Teamsters and Welfare Fund, Mounds View Public Schools*, MVP, North State Bank, North States Industries Inc*, Pathways Inc., Pavers and Road Builders District Council Welfare Fund, Phoenix Children's Academy, Roofers Local 8 Insurance & Trust Fund.

San Bernardino IHSS Public Authority, SCC Healthcare Group, LLP, Schenectady ARC*, Schoharie County ARC*, Sieben Polk Law Firm, Sitel, Inc., Southern Graphic Communication Health Fund, Springbrook Standalone HRA*, St. Lawrence NYSARC*, Sunview Vineyards of California, Inc., Tandem Eastern Inc. / Consolidated Transport

Systems, Inc., Taylor Farms, Teamsters Union Local # 35, The Day Care Council/Council of Supervisors and Administrators Welfare Fund.

The Public Authority of San Luis Obispo County, The University Financing Foundation, Inc., The Village of Newark Non-Union Employee Plan*, Theatrical Stage Employees Local One, Tuff Shed, Inc., U.A. Local 13 & Employers Group Insurance Plan*, UFCW & Participating Food Industry Employers Tri-State Health & Welfare Fund, UFCW Local 1500 Welfare Fund, UFCW Local One Health Care Fund, Ulster Greene ARC*, Westminster-Canterbury of Lynchburg, Wine and Liquor Salesmen of NJ, A-1 Transport, AIDS Council of Northeastern New York, Avon Central School District.

Azeros Health Plans, Inc.*, Benton County*, Bessey Tools, Inc., Canandaigua City Schools*, City of Eagan*, City of Shakopee Post-Employment Health Care Savings Account Plan *, Community Work and Independence Inc., Continuing Developmental Services, Crystal Cabinet Works, Inc., CU*Answers, Inc., Euromarket Designs, Inc., d/b/a Crate and Barrel, First National Bank of Dieterich, Franziska Racker Centers*, Fridley Public Schools Health Savings Plan*, FSA/SUNYAB-Campus Dining and Shops, Genesee County ARC*.

Genesee County Economic Development Corp Health Reimbursement Account*, Grand Island Central School District*, Hammondsport Central School District, Imperial Wholesale, Inc., Learning Disabilities Association of Western New York, Minnesota State Retirement System Post-Employment, Health Care Savings Plan—City of

Roseville*, Naples Central School District, Naples Central School District Support Staff, Newark Central School District, Niagara-Wheatfield CSD Self Funded, Panama Central School District, People 1st Health Strategies, Inc., Pipe Fitters' Welfare Fund, Local 597*, Ron Clark Construction Health reimbursement Arrangement*.

Sherman Central School District, Silver Creek Central School District*, Sodus Central School District, Telco Construction, Town of Albion, Town of Chenango, Town of Lockport, Twin City Die Casting*, Western Area Volunteer Emergency Services*, Westfield Academy*, Williamson Central School District, American Radio Association Plan, Carpenters Health and Security Trust of Western Washington, Communicare Health Benefits Trust, District Council 1707 Local 389 Home Care Employees Health & Welfare Fund.

Health and Welfare Plan of the Laundry, Dry Cleaning Workers & Allied Industry Health Fund, Workers United, Northern Illinois and Iowa Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, Prell Services, United Food and Commercial Workers Retail Employees and Employers Health and Welfare Plan, A-1 Realty*, AABR*, ABCO Diecasters*, Alfred P. Sloan*, Alizio & Galfunt*, All American Heating and AC*, Allied Pilots Association, Amherst Central School District*, AristaCare at Meadow Springs*, Arthur Sanderson & Sons*, Associated General Contractors of ND Employees*, Autistic Service, Inc.*

Bartech Group, Basf Fuel Cell, Inc.*, Battery Park City Authority*, Battery Park City Conservancy*, Benefit Analysis Inc.*, Blaze SSI*, Blue Beacon, Board of Trustees for the Operating Engineers Local 101, Health and Welfare Fund, Business Wire*, Cargo Ventures*, Carnegie Corporation of NY*, Carpenters Local No. 491 Health & Welfare Plan, Central Laborers' Welfare Fund, Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Health and Welfare Fund, City of Cottage Grove*, City of Inver Grove Heights*, City Of Roseville MN*.

Clinton Management*, Cloquet Area Fire Department*, Cohen Partners*, Community Bank of Bergen County*, Community Mainstreaming*, Contract Cleaners Service Employees Benefit Trust, Cornerstone Search Group*, D & D Ag Supply and Construction, Inc.*, Dial Senior Management, Inc., Douglaston Development*, Dr. Margaret Andrin, MD FACOG LLC*, Dynasil Corporation*, Echo Molding*, Eighth District Electrical Benefit Fund, Electrical Workers Health and Welfare Fund, Enterprise Concrete Products, LLC Texas.

Epilepsy Foundation*, Epilepsy Foundation Northeastern New York*, Evans Chemetics*, Excellus Health Plan, Fairport Central School District*, Goodwill Industries of Central Indiana, Gregory Packaging*, Gulf Coast Health Care, Handcraft Manufacturing Corporation*, Haver Analytics Health Waiver*, Health Care Employees Dental and Medical Trust, Hiawatha Medical, Inc.*, Highfield Gardens Care Center*, Hirsch International*, Hotel, Restaurant & Bar Employees Health and Welfare Fund.

Hypex Inc.*, IBEW Local Union No. 126 Health and Welfare Fund, International Union of Operating Engineers, Supplemental Benefit Fund Local 409*, Interstate Connecting Components*, Jacobson Family Investments*, J-B Wholesale Pet Supplies*, JKL International*, Jump, Scutellaro, and Co., LLP*, KC International dba Ekman Recycling*, Kerwin Communications*, Kingstown Capital Management*, Koelman Gear Corporation*, Kramer Electronics*, Lakeview Subacute Care Center*, Langan Engineering and Financial Services, Inc.*, LBDD*, League of Minnesota Cities*, Leisure Properties LLC d/b/a Crownline Boats*.

Liberty House Nursing Home*, Lifetime Assistance, Inc*, Lincoln Hall*, Local 888 UFCW, Maharishi University of Management, Mamiya America Corporation*, Mandt Reiss & Associates PLLC, Margaret P. Muscarelle Child Dev. Center*, Merrill Farms LLC, Micelli Motors, Inc.*, Midwest Asphalt Corporation*, Midwest Teamsters, Monroe County*, Nassau County Chapter, NYSARC, Inc*, NCHC, Inc*, New York State Assn. for Retarded Children Erie Co.

Chapter dba/Heritage Centers*, NJ Society of CPAs*, North Greece Fire District*, Northern Minnesota-Wisconsin Area Retail Food Health & Welfare Fund, Ogontz Avenue Revitalization Corporation*, Parkview Care and Rehab*, PCB Machining Solutions*, PCB Piezotronics*, Philadelphia Macaroni Company*, Phoenix Partners Group, LP*, Privilege Underwriters, Inc.*, Progressive AE*, Quadrant Capital Advisors, Inc.*, Regency Management Group, LLC*, Rhoads Industries*, Roofers Local #96 Health & Welfare Fund.

Rowe and Company, Inc.*, Rush-Henrietta Central School District HRA*, Security Benefit Fund of the Uniformed Firefighters Association of New York City, SEIU Health and Welfare Fund, 2000 Seneca Cayuga ARC*, Service Employees 32BJ North Health Benefit Fund*, Sierra Video Systems*, SMEG*, Strategic Industries*, Superior Officers Council Health and Welfare Fund, Teamsters Local Union 966 Health Fund, Techno Source USA*, The Alternative Living Group, Inc.*, The Arc of Otsego (Otsego County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.)*, The Arc of Rensselaer County*, The City of Cloquet*, The Henry Luce Foundation*, The Maritime Aquarium of Norwalk, Inc.*

The Pew Charitable Trusts*, The Rehabilitation Center*, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation*, Topco*, Totino Grace High School*, Urstadt Biddle Properties*, W.H. Reaves & Co., Inc.*, Walder, Hayden & Brogan, PA*, Walters-Morgan Construction, Inc., Wellspring Advisors*, West Bergen Mental Healthcare*, Westchester ARC*, West-

chester JCS*, Western Beef*, Hollow Metal Trust Fund, Theatrical Teamsters Local 817 IBT Welfare Fund.

Vestal Manufacturing Enterprises, Inc., AccessAbility, Inc., Ackerman Oil Employee Benefit Trust, Albany County Chapter, NYSARC Inc., DBA New Visions of Albany*, American Eagle Outfitters, Basin Disposal, Bengard Ranch, Inc., Bestway Rental, Inc., Big Lots, Inc., Byrd Harvest, Inc., Cardinal Hayes Home for Children HRA Plan*, CDS Administrative Services, LLC, Center for Energy and Environment*, City of Brooklyn Park*, D'Arrigo Bros. Co. of California, Defender Services, Inc., DineEquity, Inc.

Green Leaf Distributors, Inc., IBEW Local Union No. 728 Family Healthcare Plan, Joseph Gallo Farms, Life Benefit Plan, Luther Automotive Group HRA*, Metrics Inc., Nueces County Appraisal District, Ocean Properties Ltd, P-R Farms, Inc., SEIU Health & Welfare Fund, Sports Arena Employees' Local 137 Welfare Fund, Staywell Saipan Basic Plan, Truck Drivers and Helpers Local 355 Health and Welfare Fund, Communications Workers of America, Local 1180 Security Benefits Fund, Health and Welfare Fund of the Detectives' Endowment Association, Inc. Police Department City of New York.

Man-U Service Contract Health and Welfare Fund, Paschall Truck Lines, Inc., SEIU Local 300, Civil Service Forum Employees Welfare Fund, Electrical Welfare Trust Fund, Highmark West Virginia Inc. d/b/a Mountain State Blue Cross Blue Shield, Advocacy and Resource Center*, Amalgamated, Industrial and Toy & Novelty Workers of America, Local 223 Sick Benefit Fund, Atlanta Plumbers & Steamfitters Fringe Benefit Funds.

Aurora Consulting Group, Inc.*, Brock Enterprises, Inc., Central Texas Health and Benefit Trust Fund Locals 520, 60 & 72, Electricians Health, Welfare & Pension Plans I.B.E.W. Local Union No. 995, Essex County Chapter NYSARC, Inc. dba Mountain Lake Services*, Executive Management Services, Inc.

Florida Laborers Health Fund, Fulton County Chapter NYSARC, Inc.*, General Parts, LLC*, Greystone Program, Inc*, Hacienda Harvesting, Inc., IBEW Local No. 640 and Arizona Chapter NECA Health & Welfare Trust Fund, Lone Star Park at Grand Prairie, Louisiana Electrical Health Fund, Maverick, Inc. Employee Health Care Benefits Plan, Memphis Construction Benefit Fund, Mid-South Carpenters Regional Council Health and Welfare Fund, Mountain Lake Services, NECA-IBEW Local 480 Health and Welfare Plan, Plumbers and Pipefitters Welfare Fund of Local Union No. 719.

Retiree Plan of the Central States, Southeast and Southwest Areas Health and Welfare Fund, Richmond Community Services*, Sheet Metal Workers Local No. 177 Health and Welfare, Pension and Vacation Funds, Sheet Metal Workers' National Health Fund, South Central Laborers' Health & Welfare Fund, Southeastern Pipetrades Health & Welfare Fund, Telamon Corporation Health Reimbursement Arrangement*, The ARC of Delaware County*, UFCW Local 1262 and Employers Health & Welfare Fund, United Cerebral Palsy of Ulster County, Inc*, Vincent B Zaninovich & Sons, Inc., Wayne ARC Stand-alone HRA Section 105 Plan*, Wildwood Program*, Allied Welfare Fund.

Becker County Post-Retirement Health Care Savings Plan*, Becker County VEBA*, FIDUCIA*, Triple-S Salud, Inc., B. R. Company, Britz Companies, ET AL, Century Health and Wellness Benefit Plan and Trust, EBSA Foundation Encore Enterprises, Faurecia USA Holdings, Goodwill Industries of Kentucky, Inc., Minnesota Cement Masons Health and Welfare Fund, Plumbers Local

Union No. 690 of Philadelphia and Vicinity Health Plan, Robert Heath Trucking Inc., Securitas Security Services USA, Inc., Sunwest Fruit Company, Inc., The Louis Berger Group, Inc.

United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Midwest Health Benefits Fund, WD Young & Sons, Inc., Atlantis Casino Resort Spa, United Food and Commercial Workers and Employers Arizona, Act Trust Mini-Med Plan, Allen's Family Food, Anderson Media Corporation, Blasters, Drillers & Miners Union Local No. 29 Welfare Fund, Care Initiatives, Inc., Cement and Concrete Workers District Council Welfare Fund Plan, COARC*, Construction Workers Local 147 Welfare Fund, Crystal Run Healthcare, Diamondback Management Services, LTD, Freeman Metal Products, Hardwick Clothes, Inc., Hronis, Inc.

International Union of Bricklayers & Allied Craftworkers, Isaacson Isaacson Seridan & Fountain, LLP, Katy Industries, Inc., Landscape, Irrigation and Lawn Sprinkler Industry Health and Welfare Plan and Trust, Local 298 Health Benefit Fund Plan, Local 803 Health and Welfare Fund, Louisiana Laborers Health and Welfare Fund, M.A. Mortenson, Maple Knoll Communities, Marshall Durbin Food Corporation, Minnesota Teamsters Construction Division, Name Brand, Inc., Oklahoma Goodwill Industries, PepsiCo, Inc., Plumbers & Pipefitters Local Union 823 Health & Welfare Fund, Plumbers & Steamfitters Local No. 6 Health and Welfare Fund, Regent Care Center, Rice Food Markets, Inc., Rice Food Markets, Inc.

Ricker Oil Company, Skilled Health Care, Southwestern Teamsters Security Fund, Teamsters Local 445 Welfare Plan, Teamsters Local 210 Affiliated Health and Insurance Fund, Teamsters Welfare Fund of Northern New Jersey Local 1723, The Durango Herald, The Talbots, Inc., Town of Frisco Medical Plan, Tudor Ranch,

UNITE HERE Local 74 Welfare and Dental Trust, United Employees Health Plans, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000 and Kroger Dallas Health and Welfare Plan, United Service Employees Union, Local 377, RWDSU, UFCW, WageWorks, Inc.

IBEW Local 613 and Contributing Employers Family Health Plan (Union), Advantage Benefits Company, LLC, Aerospace Contractors' Trust**, AJFC Community Action Plan**, Altisource Portfolio Solutions, American Heritage Life Insurance Company, Americare Properties, Inc., AMN Healthcare, Andrews Transport L.P.**, Anoka Hennepin Credit Union***, APWU Health Plan Conversion Plan, Aspen Snowmass**, ATCO Rubber Products, Inc, Baylor County Hospital District, Belk Farms**, Bricklayers Local 1 of MD, VA and DC, Cardon & Associates, Inc**, Catholic Charities of the Diocese of Ogdensburg.

Central Mills**, Civil Service Bar Association Security Benefit Fund**, Cotton Belt Inc.**, CPC Logistics Health & Welfare Plan**, Delmarva United Food and Commercial Workers**, Dole Food Company**, EchoStar**, First Acceptance Corporation, Fontanese Folts Aubrecht Ernst Architects, PC**, Forest Products Inc. Group Health Plan**, Fruhauf Uniform Direct Labor, Golden State Bulb Growers, Inc.**, Greater Kansas City Laborers Welfare Fund**, Grower's Transport LLC, Heartland Automotive**, Helfman Enterprises, Inc.**, Hoosier Stamping and Manufacturing Corp., Horizon Bay Realty LLC**, I.B.E.W. Local 1249 Insurance Fund**, Ingomar Packing Company, LLC.

Integra Healthcare, Inc. (Integrity Home Care)**, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers**, International Brotherhood of Trade Unions Health and Welfare Fund—Local 713, International Union of Operating Engineers Local 295-295C Welfare Trust

Fund**, International Union of Operating Engineers, Local Union Number 137**, Iron Workers Local Union #28 Health and Welfare Fund**, Lamanuzzi & Pantaleo**, Living Resources**, Local 1102 Amalgamated Welfare Fund, Local 1102 Health & Benefit Fund, Local 1102 Welfare Fund—Lerner Employees, Local 272 Welfare Fund**, Local 338 Affiliated Benefit Funds, Madelia Community Hospital**, Max Homes, Loc**, Medical Development Corporation**, Mesa Air Group**, Mesa Packing** Michigan Conference of Teamsters Welfare Fund**, Minnesota and North Dakota Bricklayers and Allied Craftworkers**.

Mission Linen Supply, NFI Industries, Operating Engineers Local 835 Health and Welfare Fund, Opportunity Resources, Inc. Health and Welfare Plan, Orange County AHRC**, Orscheln Industries, Pacific Risk Management**, Pearson Candy Company, Pinnacle PRM**, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local 430 Health and Welfare Fund**, Progressive Logistics Services**, Pure Air Filter Sales & Service**, Rancho Maria PRM**, Reiter Affiliated Companies**, Retail, Wholesale & Dept. Store Union Local 1034 Welfare Fund.

Rio Farms PRM**, Sensient Technologies Corp., Service Employees International Union Local 1 Cleveland Welfare Fund, SFN Group, Sheet Metal Workers Funds of Local Union 38**, SMWIA 28**, Southeast OBGYN, PC***, Southern CA Pipe Trades Trust Fund, Southern Operators Health Fund**, Stonebridge Hospitality Associates**, Sun Healthcare Group, Inc., Teamsters Local 522 Welfare Fund Roofers Division, Teamsters Local Union 72 Welfare Fund**, Telesis Management Corporation, Texas Carpenters and Millwrights Health and Welfare Fund, The Mentor Network, The Wada Farms, Inc.

The Wilks Group, Inc. dba Ashley Furniture Homestore, The Wright Travel Agency**, Town of Grand Island***, Trans-System, Inc., True Leaf Farms**, UFCW Local 371 Amalgamated Welfare Fund**, United Crafts Benefits Fund**, United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Local No. 348 Health & Welfare Fund**.

United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1445 New Hampshire, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 1459 and Contributing Employers Health and Welfare Fund**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 464a**, United Food and Commercial Workers Local 911**, Varsity Contractors, Inc., Waffle House, Weckworth Manufacturing**, Western Express, Inc., Western Harvesting PRM Health Plan**, WG Yates and Sons Construction Company**, World Class Automotive**, Yukon-Kuskokwim Health Corporation**, Alaska Pipe Trade U.A. Local 367 Health and Security Trust**, Amalgamated National Health Fund.

American Farms, PRM Health Plan**, American Growers Cooling, PRM Health Plan**, AUTO, LP, dba AutoInc. Health Benefit Plan**, Better Way Partners, LLC**, Big Valley Labor, PRM Health Plan**, CB Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, City of Rockwall**, Cocopah Nurseries, Inc., Express Harvesting, PRM Health Plan**, Fallen Oak Packing, PRM Health Plan**, FirstCarolinaCare Insurance Company on behalf of Longworth Industries, Foot Locker, Inc.**, Fresh Express, G&H Farms, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Ranch, PRM Health Plan**, Gill Transport, PRM Health Plan**, Gills Onions, PRM Health Plan**, Green Valley Farm Supply, PRM Health Plan**, Greencroft Communities, Growers Express, PRM Health Plan**, Hall Management Group, Inc.**, IH Services**, Independent Group Home Living Program, Inc.

King City Nursery, PRM Health Plan**, Meijer Health Benefits Plan/Primary Care Option, Mission Ranches, PRM Health

Plan**, Moore's Retread & Tire of the Ark-La-Tex, Inc., NOITU Insurance Trust Fund**, Payroll Solutions, Plumbers and Pipefitters Local No. 630 Welfare Fund, Seco Packing, Transcorr, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1000, United Wire, Metal & Machine Health & Welfare Fund**, Western Growers Assurance Trust, Wisconsin United Food & Commercial Workers Unions and Employers Health Plan**, 1199SEIU Greater New York Benefit Fund, A. Duda & Sons, Inc., Adecco Group, Inc., Biomedic Corporation, Buffets, Inc.

Carington Health System, Cleveland Bakers Teamsters, Club Chef LLC, Columbia Sussex Mgmt, LLC, CRST International Inc., Darr Equipment, Co., DC Cement Masons Welfare Fund, Deaconess Long Term Care, Diamond Comic Distributors, Inc., ECOM Atlantic, Inc., FW Walton, Inc., G4S Secure Solutions, GC Services, L.P. & First Community Bancshares, Inc., Guardsmark, LLC, Indiana Teamsters Health Benefits Fund, Knox County Association for Retarded Citizens, Laundry and Dry Cleaning Workers Local No. 52, Mars Super Markets, Inc., MPS Group, Inc.

Nexion Health, Noodles & Company, Pharmacia Integrative Pharmacy, Quality Integrated Services, Inc., RE Rabalais Constructors, LTD, RREMC LLC, Security Forces Inc., Shirley Nursing.

Social Service Employees Union Local 371, Spindle, Cooling, & Warehouse, Strauss Discount Auto, Sunburst Hospitality, Susser Holding Corp, Telescope Casual Furniture, Teletech Holdings, Inc., The Brinkman Corporation, The LDF Companies, United Food and Commercial Workers Union (Mount Laurel, NJ), United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1459 Universal Orlando, Valley Services, Inc.

United Food and Commercial Workers and Participating Employers Interstate Health and Welfare Fund, Protocol Marketing Group, Sasnak, Star Tek, Adventist Care Centers, B.E.S.T of NY, Boskovich Farms, Inc, Café Enterprises, Inc., Capital District Physicians, FleetPride, Inc., Gallegos Corp, Hensley Industries, Inc., Jeffords Steel and Engineering, Laborers' International Union of North America Local Union No. 616 Health and Welfare Plan, O.K. Industries, Service Employees Benefit Fund, Sun Pacific Farming Coop, SunWorld International, LLC.

UFCW Allied Trade Health & Welfare Trust, United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1995, HCR Manor Care, IBEW No. 915, Integra BMS for Culp, Inc., New England Health Care Employees Welfare Fund†, Williamson-Dickie Manufacturing Company, Aegis Security Insurance Company†, Alliance One Tobacco, Asbestos Workers Local 53 Welfare Fund, Assurant Health (2nd Application), Captain Elliot's Party Boats, Carlson Restaurants, CH Guenther & Son, CKM Industries dba Miller Environmental, Caribbean Workers' Voluntary Employees' Beneficiary Health and Welfare Plan†, Darden Restaurants, Duarte Nursery.

Employees Security Fund, Florida Trowel Trades, Ingles Markets, Meijer, O'Reilly Auto Parts, Plumbers & Pipefitters Local 123 Welfare Fund, Sun Belt, UFCW Local 227, Uncle Julio's, United Group, US Imaging, Vito Farms, AdvantaStaff, Inc.†, Agricare, Alaska Seafood, American Fidelity, Convergys, Darensberries, Gowan Company, Greystar, Macayo Restaurants, Periodical Services, UniFirst, Universal Forest Products, UFCW Maximus Local 455, American Habilitation Services, Inc.†, GuideStone Financial Resources, Local 25 SEIU, MAUSER Corp., Preferred Care, Inc.

Ruby Tuesday, The Dixie Group, Inc., UFCW Local 1262, Whelan Security Company, AMF Bowling Worldwide, Assisted Living Concepts, Case & Associates, GPM Investments, Grace Living Centers, Mountaire

Corporation†, Swift Spinning, Belmont Village, Caliber Services, Cracker Barrel, DISH Network, Groendyke Transport, Inc., Pocono Medical Center, Regis Corporation, The Pictsweet Co.

Diversified Interiors, Local 802 Musicians Health Fund, MCS Life Insurance Company†, The Buccaneer, CIGNA, Greater Metropolitan Hotel, Local 17 Hospitality Benefit Fund, GSC-ILA, The Allied Industries Health Fund, Harden Healthcare, Vernon Sheltered Workshop, Inc. Health and Welfare Plan #501, I.U.P.A.T., Sanderson Plumbing Products, Inc.

Transport Workers, United Federation of Teachers Welfare Fund, Aegis, Aetna, Allflex, Baptist Retirement, BCS Insurance, Cryogenic, Fowler Packing Co., Guy C. Lee Mfg., HealthPort, Jack in the Box, Maritime Association, Maverick County, Metropolitan D.C. Paving Industry Employees Health and Welfare Fund, PMPS-ILA, PS-ILA, QK/DRD (Denny's), Reliance Standard, Tri-Pak, United Agricultural Benefit Trust.

Mrs. BACHMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas, Judge TED POE, because what we are fighting is to make ObamaCare equal for all Americans.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair and to refrain from engaging in personalities with regard to the President.

AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, we just heard a remarkable hour of problems that were so overblown as to be really not worthy of much discussion. But I think the American public really needs to understand what this last hour was all about. In fact, the Affordable Health Care Act is working. And it's actually working very, very well for millions upon millions of Americans.

I just want to read some facts and then move on to what is really going on here, which is an effort to try to leverage the necessity of funding the Federal Government, which is something we must do every year to provide the money to continue all of the work of the Federal Government. They're trying to use that as a lever to gain something that they've been unable to do in a Presidential election year.

The last Presidential election year, the issue of the Affordable Health Care Act was front and center, and the American people heard more than a year of debate about the Affordable Health Care Act, whether it was good or not so good, all the benefits and all of the problems that it might be. At the end, in November of last year, the American public decisively said that the Affordable Health Care Act and President Obama should continue. That was the decision by Americans.

In the House of Representatives we gained seats on the Democrat side, and

I think about 2 million more voted Democratic than they voted Republican. Although, because of the redistricting and the gerrymandering, the House remained in Republican hands.

Just understand what's going on here. What could not be achieved in the democratic process of an election is attempted to be achieved in two absolutely critical moments in the annual processing of the Federal Government.

The first moment, which comes up on October 1, is the necessity to provide money to carry on all of the tasks of the Federal Government—the Social Security Administration, the National Parks, and on and on. Nearly every aspect of the Federal Government has to be funded every year. That is a moment that is now being used as a lever to try to achieve what could not be achieved in an election. After all, America is a democracy. We make our decisions through the electoral process, not by trying to lever, using a critical moment, basically, the funding of the American Government.

Now two or 3 weeks beyond October 1 there will be yet another moment of critical importance, and that is the ability of the American Government to continue to pay its bills. It's called the debt limit. Until 2011, this was a routine process in which the Congress would continue to say, Okay, we will increase the debt limit so that we can pay our bills.

It was done during Democrat and Republican administrations routinely. There was always some discussion about the debt and the deficit, as it should be. In fact, the President, Mr. Obama, when he was in the Senate, railed against this issue of deficit. Now he's on the other side of that. That often happens.

But the fact of the matter is that in this process, these two moments of time are now being used as a lever to achieve in the legislative process what could not be achieved in the electoral process. So much for democracy.

Just a few facts about the Affordable Care Act, or ObamaCare, as it's become to be known.

Nearly 13 million Americans have benefited from over \$1.1 billion in rebates from insurance companies. I was the insurance commissioner in California in 8 years. And I knew then, as I know now, that the insurance companies were overcharging the public for their health insurance policies. However, I did not have any authority under California law to order rebates.

The Affordable Health Care Act sets up a system that requires the insurance companies to pay at least 80 percent of the premium dollar for medical services. If they don't, they have to do a rebate. It's the law that they want to repeal. That's \$1.1 billion.

Also, 105 million Americans, including 71 million Americans in private plans and 34 million seniors in Medicare, have received access to free preventative services. Do you want to hold down the cost of medical services? Do prevention.

The Affordable Health Care Act requires that every insurance policy, including Medicare, provide a free medical checkup every year. Guess what has happened? The cost curve has bent downward. Why? Because serious illnesses are either treated or delayed. Diabetes, strokes, and heart conditions are analyzed early and treated, reducing the cost of health care and, far more important, keeping people alive and healthy.

Moving on. Thirty million women are receiving free coverage for comprehensive women's preventative services, including a well-woman visit and diabetes screening. They want to repeal that: 30 million American women receiving free diagnostic care. They want to repeal it.

Seventeen million children with pre-existing health conditions can no longer be denied coverage. I was the insurance commissioner. I cannot tell you the numbers of times that I begged for a law that would require insurance companies to continue or to provide insurance for a newborn child that had a serious illness, time after time, in California. Insurance companies would insure the mother for the delivery. And the moment that child was delivered, the child had no coverage. Bankruptcies and lack of medical care ensued. Seventeen million children will be denied health care coverage if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act. That's 17 million children.

Also, 6.6 million young adults to the age of 26 have taken advantage of the ObamaCare law, the Affordable Health Care Act, to stay on their parents' health insurance plan. Do you have a kid in college or a kid that's graduated from college that's 21 or 22? They can stay on your plan. Before the Affordable Care Act, before ObamaCare, they had very little opportunity to get insurance. They would have to go out and buy their own policy. They were able to stay on their parents' policy. That's 6.6 million young adults that will not be insured if they are successful in repealing the Affordable Health Care Act.

Also, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion. Previously, most health insurance policies in the United States set a limit on the amount of coverage that a person could have during their lifetime or in a given year. Now, 100 million Americans no longer have a lifetime exclusion, and 100 million Americans are able to get comprehensive coverage for the duration of their illness. They want to affect the well-being of 100 million Americans.

You've heard about the senior doughnut hole, the drug coverage. Written into the law in 2003, providing drug coverage for seniors—Medicare part D—was a doughnut hole. You got the first couple of thousand dollars covered. After that, 100 percent of the cost had to be paid by the seniors.

The Affordable Health Care Act is shrinking the doughnut hole every

year. And in another 2 or 3 years, that doughnut hole will be closed, providing an extraordinarily important benefit to seniors. I know this problem in my communities. Before the Affordable Health Care Act, before ObamaCare, seniors would reach that doughnut hole threshold and they could not afford to continue to buy their pharmaceutical products. So what did they do? Their blood pressure went up, their diabetes was not treated, and they became seriously ill.

They want to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, and the doughnut hole will not be closed if they are successful.

Shall we continue on?

□ 1230

In California, on October 1, 4 million Californians for the first time will have access to an insurance exchange, a marketplace, a free marketplace—which we talk about all the time. But one does not exist in California until October 1, where the uninsured in California, including this Member of Congress, will be able to go to a rational marketplace that lists numerous health care policies, five different levels of coverage, all of them uniform, all of them priced, where 1 and 4 million other Californians can select the policy of our choice—not a government policy, but a private insurance company policy; a marketplace, a free market solution to the 40 million Americans that are not insured and the 4 million in California that are not insured today.

We rail back and forth, Democrats and Republicans alike, about the necessity of a free market. For the first time ever in this Nation, a free market, rational market system is established, not only in California, but in every State in this Union. And thirty-three State Governors have refused to set up a free market rational system called an exchange—called an exchange in which insurance companies will lay out their policies, lay out their price, lay out their coverages, exclusions and the rest; and the public will be able to have price information, quality information, and make a choice. That's what's called a free market. And they want to repeal it. So what are those people to do?

You know, 435 of us represent the people of America. I spent an hour listening to some 20 people who may, in their own mind, believe that they're representing their people. But I know, from my experience as insurance commissioner in California, that for the first time across this Nation, we have the opportunity to have a market system, a health insurance market system that is rational, that is sensible, in which prices are available, in which quality and multiple products are available—not a government-run health system, but rather a market system established by this government so that the people of this Nation can pick and choose which private policy they want.

If you're over 65, you can get your Medicare; and you will continue to get it with the additional benefits that are in the Affordable Care Act. If you're not yet 65 and you happen to have been unemployed at the age of 50, prior to the Affordable Care Act you were in the deepest of trouble. You were virtually uninsurable. Why? Because you were 50 years of age. You were entering that period when you were expensive; you were likely to get health issues. Insurance companies routinely discriminated against you. If you happen to be a woman, you were in even deeper trouble. Those days are gone—unless the Republican Party succeeds in repealing, delaying, and defunding the Affordable Care Act.

The American people have an opportunity today to get insurance—or they will on October 1. Exchanges will operate across the country, some run by States such as California and New York, where the Governor said this makes sense to the people in my State and we're going to do it. Others, like Texas and Montana, the Governor said, oh, we don't care about our people; therefore, the Federal Government is stepping in to set up exchanges.

Whatever you may have heard over this last hour about a government-run health care system, it is not true, except if you happen to be on Medicare. Medicare is a government-run health insurance program in which the delivery is not provided by the government, but provided by a multiplicity of health care providers. Individual doctors, groups of doctors, hospitals, big health care medical centers such as the University of California-San Francisco. Yes, Medicare is a government health insurance system; it is not a delivery system. There is one, however; it's called the U.S. military. Military hospitals and veterans hospitals, those are government delivery systems.

So whatever you may have heard about the government takeover of health care, not true unless you happen to be in the military, a veteran, or on Medicare. Even the Medicaid program is State run, not run by the Federal Government.

Oh, there are so many falsehoods. You could fill this entire room with the falsehoods that we've heard over the last months. But the reality is that the Affordable Health Care Act is good for America. It is reducing the inflation rate in health care. We've already seen the lowest inflation rate in the last 3 years, since the enactment of the Affordable Health Care Act, over the last 25 years.

So are we going to shut down government so that the opponents who failed in an election, who failed in Congress in 2010 to stop the Affordable Care Act, failed in the Presidential election, in Senate elections, are we going to shut down government so that they can leverage something that they could not achieve in an electoral process? I don't think so. I don't think the American Government will stand for it. I don't

think the American people will stand for it.

I wanted to talk about jobs. I wanted to talk about my district. I wanted to talk about the necessity of a farm bill so that there will be food on the table for the poor, so that there will be a program that the farmers in my district will know what they will face as they begin to plant their winter crops. That bill languishes because of this process that we're seeing.

I wanted to talk about a transportation bill that we must write and fund so that we can build the infrastructure, so that we can put people back to work. But, no, we're caught up here in this process.

There are things that we need to do in America, and here we are. Here we are. This is not good for America. The Affordable Health Care Act is good for Americans. And when we provide health insurance for every American, we will be a much more just society, and we will have a stronger economy. This road is out ahead of us.

I'm going to be joined by my colleagues. I yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WILSON).

Ms. WILSON of Florida. Thank you for sharing this hour with me, Representative GARAMENDI from California, my dear friend.

Mr. Speaker, who could be against making every American eligible for health care insurance? I can't even imagine. So I'm here today to help set the record straight about ObamaCare. I'm here to explain what ObamaCare means to the people in my community and the people around this Nation. And I'm here to explain the truth—the real truth—behind the health care reforms that are moving ahead on Tuesday, October 1, simply because Obama cares.

Mr. Speaker, this health reform is about making it easier and cheaper to get insurance if you don't have it. It's that simple.

Our President, Barack Obama, cares and is making health care easier to obtain. He cares and is making health care more affordable. President Barack Obama cares and is making health care more accessible.

Now, listen up: if you have Medicare, this does not apply to you. This has absolutely nothing to do with you. It will not affect your coverage. If you have Medicaid, this does not apply to you. If you have a job with health care coverage, this does not apply to you.

ObamaCare only applies if you do not currently have insurance. You will finally have the opportunity to gain protection for your body. You will finally find peace of mind. You no longer have to live in fear of being bankrupted by a health emergency. You no longer will have to let your health suffer by avoiding the doctor. You no longer will have to fear for your family going without care.

Mr. Speaker, there are very simple steps for getting started if you're insured. Because Obama cares, you can

get started with these simple directions. If you have access to the Internet, you can get started right away.

Beginning Tuesday, October 1, Healthcare.gov will give you all the information you need to sign up for this program. Once you're there, go to the tab that says "get insurance."

Mr. Speaker, this will take you to a page that will explain all the insurance marketplaces available to you. You will be able to compare all the plans available to you in your area.

Mr. Speaker, the Internet is the best way to sign up; but if you're not comfortable using a computer, ask a friend, or ask a young relative to help you survey the choices. Young people know all about computers. If you need additional help, you can also call 1-800-318-2596. People are available around the clock to offer assistance in more than 150 languages—and in Miami, that is very important. They can help you enroll by mail if you prefer.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares so much that there will also be expert advisers called "navigators" in your community. You can find them at community health centers, at the mall, in drugstores, and in many places of worship. In some States, traditional insurance agents and brokers will be able to help. But remember this: if someone tries to charge you money for advice on how to sign up, say "no" because it is a scam. No one should be charged for assistance in signing up.

Mr. Speaker, Americans should take their time in completing the important task of choosing the right health insurance plan. I know sometimes it can take 2 hours to choose the right pair of shoes at the mall or 2 hours at the kitchen table to choose the right cable TV plan.

□ 1245

Be patient. Take your time in choosing the right plan to protect your body and your life. You won't regret it.

Mr. Speaker, Obama cares because health reform is not only about making insurance simple, but also making it affordable. Let me just give you a couple of examples:

A self-employed person with a spouse and two children and a household income of \$33,000 would more than likely not be able to afford insurance at all today, but starting Tuesday, October 1, this person would be able to get insurance for his entire family for an average of \$94 per month because of a government subsidy;

A single mother with three children and a household income of \$40,000 will now be able to insure herself and her children for an average of \$163 per month through ObamaCare.

Mr. Speaker, it's affordable and it's essential to be covered. Young people under 26 will be able to stay on their parents' plans. For those young people without the opportunity to join their parents' plans, it's especially important for you to get insurance.

If you're young, you're statistically more likely to end up in a car crash or

a motorcycle crash or to experiment with drugs or other risky behavior that lands you into trouble. You need insurance as much or more than anyone else. You have to pay to insure that car, you have to pay to insure that motorcycle, so make sure that you pay a very small portion of that first paycheck you earn to insure your precious body.

Mr. Speaker, no one said this would be easy. There will be challenges as the Federal Government implements the new insurance markets in 36 States in the weeks ahead. But progress is never easy. Nothing this important and ambitious is easy. There will be needed tweaking and needed corrections. But that was also the case in 1935 when we rolled out Social Security and in 1965 when we rolled out Medicare.

Mr. Speaker, we know that Obama cares because insurance companies can no longer deny 17 million children with preexisting conditions their health coverage. We know that Obama cares because 105 million Americans with life-threatening diseases like cancer no longer have to live in fear of maxing out on their lifetime dollar limits on their insurance coverage. We know that Obama cares because more than 3 million young people up to the age of 26 now have coverage because insurance companies can no longer remove them from their parents' plans.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, we are well on our way to a healthier, more financially secure Nation. We refuse, we utterly refuse, to allow anyone to damage, repeal, or turn back ObamaCare. It is the law of the land and it is here to stay. We will stand up for those who cannot stand up for themselves. We will speak out for those who cannot speak for themselves. We will do all this and more because President Barack Hussein Obama cares. He cares for the people of this Nation.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Ms. WILSON. Thank you for laying out the way in which the Affordable Care Act will benefit and how people can use that act, how they can access the exchanges and the benefits that are found in it.

I would like now to call on one of my colleagues from the Midwest, Mr. RYAN, if you would care to join us.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman; I thank the lady.

This is, obviously, a very important issue for all of us around the country—in Ohio, especially. We have a very unique situation going on in Ohio. As I heard in the previous Special Order, I heard many members of the Tea Party Caucus come up here and talk about how bad the Affordable Care Act is, how it is going to end democracy as we know it, how the sky is going to fall, and it is troubling, I think, when you actually see what the benefits are.

Let me be the first to say as, I think, even those of us who voted for the health care reform, there's a long way to go. We've got a lot of work to do. These things aren't easy. This is a very

complicated situation, a very complicated program to try to cover all 313 million Americans, try to drive down health care costs, try to move towards more prevention and wellness—very big goals in the United States, goals that we can only really achieve if we work together.

So to have one side trying to destroy what is now law in the United States, confirmed by the Supreme Court, passed by the House, the Senate, and signed by the President, approved by the Supreme Court, now as we try to stand it up, we have people trying to inject into the process not a helpful hand, not trying to make it work better, but trying to destroy it, trying to add more uncertainty here in the United States Congress, even to the brink of wanting to shut down the government or default on the credit, the full faith and credit of the United States.

All the polls are saying 60 to 70 percent, maybe in the high 50s, most Americans say we do not want you to use shutting down the government or defaulting on our debt as a way to try to push back on ObamaCare or the Affordable Care Act.

So what I'm saying is we have millions and millions of people—here's what really gets me. People walk up on the other side of the aisle, God bless them, and they act like prior to 2008–2009 we had a health care system that took care of everybody. Everybody was fine with the current. No businesses were calling our offices saying: Man, this health care is destroying my business; I can't plan ahead. It's a 30 percent increase this year; it's 70 next year. We get one person sick in a small business of 20 or 30 people, we've got to go bankrupt.

People forget. Millions of Americans. Prior to this health care law, 1,700 families in my congressional district went bankrupt because of health care. So we are not even going to talk about that? Are we going to sweep that right under the rug, the kind of suffering that goes on in some of our communities? Are we going to drive around the problem and close our eyes?

Everyone says this is a giveaway. This is not a giveaway. This is about giving people who go to work every day, sometimes two or three jobs, have a sick kid, we are just going to ignore them because we've got this bumper sticker on the back of our truck that has four little slogans on it and, boy, we can't deviate from that because we will get primaries by a Tea Party candidate because we can't check every box along the way.

But, fine, let those 1,700 families go bankrupt. Let that kid with cancer and his parents who are at Akron Children's Hospital or some other children's hospital around the United States have to deal with the fact that they hit their lifetime cap because their child has cancer.

Now, give me a break. Because you've got to stick with that bumper

sticker, you can't deviate from the bumper sticker that says "less government," we want to go back to that great health care system that left 40 million people without any health care, that kept driving up prices for small businesses, small manufacturers in Ohio.

We can maintain what is great about the American health care system. I represent a district not far from the Cleveland Clinic. We understand in northeast Ohio how powerful it is, some aspects of our health care system, but there are failures in our health care system, and we are here as Members of the United States Congress to try to fix those holes in the system and try to help our fellow citizens that may be sick, maybe can't afford it, but go to work every day just as hard as everyone else.

I will say, before I kick it to my friend from New York, that I find it very interesting that we have some Governors in some of our States, Republican Governors in some of our States, conservative Republican Governors in some of our States, Tea Party Governors in some of our States, one in Ohio was the chair of the Budget Committee during the Gingrich revolution, Governor Casey, he makes the exact same arguments for expanding Medicaid in Ohio, which he is fighting for, along with Governor Brewer out in Arizona and some others. He makes the exact same arguments that it is immoral for us to have this level of sickness in our society with people not having access to health care, that it doesn't make any sense for us to wait for somebody to get so sick and then they dump themselves into an emergency room after weeks and weeks of sickness ending up there much sicker than they should be. He, as well as others, are making the argument that prevention is the way to go, wellness is the way to go. I commend these Governors, because it makes sense.

So sit down and work with us to help stand this up to create more competition, to make sure that these young children and their families don't have to go to bed every night—and this is the last one, now trying to take any help we are giving to congressional staffers, which is floating around here. I know it's a political hot button. But my goodness gracious, we get young people that want to come to Capitol Hill, live in one of the most expensive cities in the world, make peanuts because they are ambitious and want to get ahead, and we are going to say, You are on your own with your health care, too. What are we doing? What are we doing? This doesn't make any sense.

I'm sorry. I'm sorry you don't like President Obama. I'm sorry. I don't know what to say. But to come after health care reform where so many millions of people are going to benefit. In Ohio, we are saying 6 out of 10 of the people who are uninsured in Ohio can get health care for less than 100 bucks a month. What's wrong with that? What's wrong with that?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. TONKO. Thank you, Representative RYAN. Thank you for expressing the tone of harshness that has prevailed in this Chamber.

I don't know if I can remember when a law, a standing law in this country, was used as a reason to avoid paying our bills or keeping government running. I find it regrettable that we go after the law of the land, in this case the Affordable Care Act. They'll reference it as ObamaCare, and we will see how long that label stands when the program proves successful. It might be removed immediately.

But, nonetheless, the harshness here is driven after a season, season's worth of activity on the Affordable Care Act.

□ 1300

We have voted for it in both Houses of the Congress and with bipartisan support in the Senate. The President stood for reelection, and was reelected amidst immense arguments and debates about repeal and replace by the opposition, by the candidate for President of the other major party. So the people have spoken. Then, when they elected Members to the House of Representatives, the cumulative total of votes for the Members of this House was, in the majority, calling for Democrats. The people have stated they support this. As Senator MCCAIN indicated on the floor just this week, there are consequences to elections.

It's not sinking in—or perhaps it has, but they refuse to allow their behavior to end. It's putting themselves first as political forces rather than the people, rather than what's in the best interest of the people. I'm convinced that this is driven by the fear that this ObamaCare, as they call it, will be successful and that this is their last effort possible to end the opportunity to provide affordable, accessible, quality health care for all. We know it. We see it in our States. We see it in Ohio. We see it in California. We see it in Florida. We are joined by our friend from Texas, who just visited my district this week in Albany, New York, Representative CASTRO from Texas. We see it in our home States. People have a need out there.

In my case, I can cite some of the stats: 36,000 young people with pre-existing conditions will not be biased against in having insurance. Take it away, why don't you. Take it away, and then put us at risk of defaulting with our credit rating. Take it away. Be harsh. We look at the 12,000-plus seniors who are receiving discounts for their pharmaceutical needs. Take it away, why don't you.

It's unfair. It's un-American—immoral—to take it away, but we are going to use it as a pawn in a device here called "negotiating" on whether or not the government will continue to run or on whether we will keep the doors open and the lights or on whether or not we are going to pay our bills. Come on. Working families in this

country understand it. They roll up their sleeves. They play by the rules. They work hard. They expect to taste success. They pay their bills on time, and they expect their government to do likewise.

They don't expect us to put a roadblock in the way that says the law of the land—constitutionally tested in the highest Court of the land, in the Supreme Court, and that has been given the green light—we're going to put that in as a roadblock to stop progress because we know the October 1 starting date is quickly arriving. This is grossly unfair to the people of this country.

When I look at the 124,000 seniors who are receiving free preventative services, I'm not ready to give that up. Repeal is not an answer—improving is an answer, and I will work with you—but we don't use this vehicle as a reason to stop government from running or as a vehicle from stopping us from paying America's bills. It goes on and on. There are 6,200 young people who now qualify to stay on their parents' policies for their health care coverage. This is a vast improvement. This is allowing the tens of millions of people who have been uninsured—and the many who are underinsured—to finally have access, connection, to a system.

Aren't we in this business to respond to the needs of people? Are we in the business to take the facts, twist them, present them in a way that offers confusion, and only serve for political, partisan purposes?

I think we can do better than that in this Chamber. We are going to work, and we are going to get to that finish line. I am convinced, Representative GARAMENDI, that we are going to stand for justice, for what is fairness in our society. Health care is a right. We should see it as an American right—the moral compass points in that direction—and we ought not use it as a pawn in a political theater that allows for us to not have government funded or that allows for us not to pay our bills. Let's get on with business.

What's happening in this Chamber? Are we so insensitive to the needs of people? What could be more important than responding to the health care needs of the people of this great country? Let's stop the brinksmanship. Let's get it done. Let's get business done here.

I thank you for leading us in this discussion and for having served with our all of colleagues here.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. TONKO.

In previous weeks, you and I and Mr. RYAN and Mr. CASTRO have had the pleasure of talking on this floor about putting people to work, about jobs, about creating the infrastructure, the education, the training that's necessary to move Americans, but this week, we find ourselves caught up in this leveraging of the necessity of funding government and of paying our bills—the debt limit—and using that as

a lever to destroy a very important law that provides real benefits to every American.

Mr. CASTRO, we thank you for joining us. We know that Texas was much discussed in the previous hour. I am sure that you have some thoughts about all of this, so please join us. Thank you very much.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Thank you, Congressman GARAMENDI, and thank you, Congressman TONKO and Congressman RYAN, for your very eloquent words in describing the situation that we face today.

I, like millions of Americans, hope that there will not be a government shutdown. I hope that we can get past the hostage politics that have prevailed over this place over the last few years. This is no way to run a government. Our Nation is the strongest nation on Earth, and we are the most exceptional nation on Earth. These wounds are self-inflicted ones.

I have said many times and have heard from my constituents that all of these fiscal fights, these self-inflicted wounds by Congress—when we get up to the limit where we are supposed to pass a budget or we are supposed to raise the debt ceiling limit—are causing the Nation high blood pressure. They are affecting the market in negative ways. The stock market is taking a hit. Our employment rates are taking a hit. In every way, this has been bad for the country.

I would also remind our Members of Congress and the American people about what happened the last time brinksmanship was tried. The last time this happened, the sequester resulted—a bad way to do business. I think people on both sides of the aisle would agree that the sequester did not turn out well for our Nation, but that's the same road we are headed down again. The Republicans are taking us down the same road that gave us the sequester—the Budget Control Act. Then the cuts that really were across the board were not targeted and have hurt the military, have hurt education, have hurt health care, and we are headed down the same road.

Congressman, the last time you and I spoke—I guess about a month ago here on the floor—I mentioned that, in politics, you are often asked whether you are a Republican or a Democrat. What is it that you stand for? I think, as Democrats, what we believe in are a few things that have made this Nation great.

The first is freedom, because we are a free people. That freedom has been hard fought. I come from San Antonio, Texas—Military City USA. The people of San Antonio and the people of Texas know the high price of freedom.

The second is democracy. We are a democratic Nation. Because we are free, we get to elect our leaders, and we get to kick them out of office when we no longer believe that they are representing our views and our values.

But much of the politics of today is really fought over the third principle

and value, which is opportunity. You see, what is special about this country and the reason that, for years and years, people from all over the world have wanted to come to America is that, as Americans, we have come together to build out what I call an “infrastructure of opportunity” that enables each of us to pursue our American dreams. I want to remind you of what I mean by that.

Just as there is an infrastructure of transportation—a system of streets and roads and highways that help all of us get to where we want to go on the road—in American society, we have built up together an infrastructure of opportunity that enables or at least helps each of us get to where we want to go in life, and that has to include certain things that are at risk when we get into hostage politics—great public schools and universities; a strong health care system so that, if you get sick, you don't become debilitated or die; and then an economy that's built around well-paying jobs so that people can support themselves and their family members. It's that second part that I mentioned—health care—that has been at issue in this debate.

I just want to close by saying this, that the junior Senator from Texas, a few days ago, talked about how he was speaking for 26 million Texans when he was threatening to shut down the government over the Affordable Care Act, which he derisively calls “ObamaCare.” He does not speak for 26 million Texans. The fact is that Texas has the highest percentage of people who have no health care coverage at all. There are a lot of families who are having to take their kids to the emergency rooms, who are getting letters from their insurance companies because they have hit their lifetime caps. They are getting letters of their being denied coverage because they have preexisting conditions. The Affordable Care Act is going to change that. It's going to be a good thing for our State.

So I would just note that there are a lot of people in Texas who are excited about the Affordable Care Act and about the fact that they are going to have a chance to afford to have insurance, some of them for the first time in their lives. Even of those who have insurance, many of them will no longer have to worry about being denied because of preexisting conditions, worry about hitting a lifetime cap or about going bankrupt because of health care.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you very much, Mr. CASTRO, and thank you for pointing out that one junior Senator doesn't represent all of Texas. I know you represent the heart of Texas—that is, the people of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Very good.

We are joined here now by our distinguished senior Member from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from California and all of my colleagues who came to the floor in the aftermath of that hour from the GOP side of basically criticizing, on the Republican side, the health care reform—the Affordable Care Act, also known as ObamaCare.

Sometimes, when I listen to what the Republicans say about ObamaCare, I am shocked because I don't think they understand how many people are out there who have already benefited from it and who are really looking forward to October 1 because they can sign up for the first time for health insurance. Let me tell you that, in my own district, I have had so many inquiries from people who are uninsured or underinsured or who can't afford the health insurance they have now.

I just want to say that I agree with the gentleman from California in that this was basically resolved last November. It couldn't have been clearer that the President, for whom ObamaCare is now known, was out there in the Presidential election, saying that the Affordable Care Act was a great accomplishment on his part and that he was going to continue with it. Then you had Mitt Romney on the other side, saying that, if he were elected, he was going to repeal it. So my colleague from California is right—that was resolved in the election.

So why is it that our colleagues on the Republican side are trying to hold the health care reform hostage by saying that, if we don't repeal it or delay it or defund it or whatever—we've had so many votes on this, over 40 now—that they're going to shut the government down? One has nothing to do with the other.

I just want to talk about those three groups of people who will be the most positively impacted by ObamaCare beginning October 1.

First of all, we know we have about 40 million Americans who are uninsured. Many of them are from New Jersey. They don't have health insurance options right now. This is going to be the first time, on October 1, that they will actually have a rational, legitimate option to get health insurance, and they are waiting for October 1 to come around.

Secondly, we have just as many people—maybe 80 million people—who may have health insurance, but it's very skeletal. It doesn't provide much in the way of benefits, and they have to pay a lot of money out-of-pocket if they get sick or if they have to go to the hospital or whatever. Those people will also benefit because every health insurance policy that's offered under the health exchange, as the gentleman from California talked about, will be a good benefit package, at least as good as what we know as, say, Blue Cross-Blue Shield.

Then you have the third group of people who may have health insurance, but they're spending so much money in order to make sure that they have

health insurance that they can't pay for their rent or they can't pay for their mortgage or they can't put food on the table.

All of these people are going to benefit come October 1, when they can sign up for a good package and an affordable package. One of the main reasons it's affordable is that the Federal Government is helping pay the premium—is helping subsidize the premium—with tax credits but not with tax credits that you have to pay up front and then get a refund for when you file next April 15, but a tax credit like a subsidy that goes directly to pay for the premium.

We are already hearing—and I've said this to my colleagues in New Jersey—that the average health insurance policy is going to be about \$350 a month. Some people say, "Oh, \$350 a month," but that is incredibly affordable for a lot of people in New Jersey who are paying a lot more right now, and that's without the subsidy. With the subsidy, that can go down to \$100 a month depending upon your income.

So I can't stress enough how important this is, and for the Republicans to try to hold this hostage, no one on our side of the aisle is going to give up on the Affordable Care Act, because we know people need it. We are going to move forward, and, hopefully, they come to their senses and don't keep trying to shut this government down.

I want to commend the gentleman again. Thank you.

□ 1315

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for your comments about New Jersey.

Mr. RYAN, I think we have maybe 2½ minutes left if you'd like to close, and I'll take the last 30 seconds and then we'll thank the public for their attention.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I think the last couple of points I would like to make is that we have very conservative Republican Tea Party Governors saying, We want to expand Medicaid, and they make all of the same arguments that we made during the health care debate. Coming into an emergency room and getting your primary care does not make any sense; you get sicker and it costs more money. There is also a moral aspect that we've got millions and millions of people going bankrupt, children not getting treatment, hitting the ceiling when they have cancer or some other issue. Those problems have been fixed.

Folks here in the House of Representatives, they need to recognize just how extreme their position is. When Karl Rove and JOHN MCCAIN and some of these other folks are saying, You folks are really out on a limb here, you're not making a lot of sense, that's not TIM RYAN and Mr. GARAMENDI and Mr. PALLONE and others who they would call liberals. That's Karl Rove, Bush's brain, who is telling you you're way out on a limb on this one, and it

doesn't make any sense. I think that's important. You have Republican Tea Party Governors making the same argument about expanding Medicaid. Critical, critical, critical points.

Lastly, as we see the top 1 percent and the top one-tenth of 1 percent garnering almost a third of the wealth created from 2009 to 2012, we've got a problem in this country. If we can't step in and say at the very least we can give some of these folks some basic health care, then we have to ask ourselves what kind of country we really want to live in.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. RYAN and Mr. PALLONE, thank you so very much for joining us on this discussion about the Affordable Care Act and the way in which the Republican Party here in the House is using its repeal as a lever to really shut down government. It's not a good situation.

We normally spend our time here on the floor talking about jobs, infrastructure, how we can move this committee and this Nation forward. We hope to get back to that next week. We've got a critical vote coming in the next couple of days, or tomorrow or the next day, about the health care of America and more importantly about the way in which this government should operate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

OBAMACARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I heard our President in a speech that I heard this morning say that in essence people who watch Fox News think ObamaCare is terrible, there are all kinds of problems. I sure hope that our President will start watching something besides CNN or MSNBC so he can find out that everything he's done is not made of gold, that people are hurting across America.

They heard him when the President promised that if you like your insurance, you'll get to keep it. He said it over and over and over and over: if you like your insurance, you can keep it. He made that speech across the Nation over and over and over.

He said that if you like your doctor, you can keep your doctor. It turns out that wasn't true. If you like your insurance, you're probably going to lose it or it's going to cost a whole lot more. That's what people are finding across the country.

So I appreciate my colleagues talking about and actually saying some of the same things about ObamaCare that they said 3½ years ago. The trouble is now that ObamaCare is upon us and people are being hurt. They've lost their insurance, and they've lost their doctor. They can't afford the extra thousands of dollars it is costing. I think it was PolitiFact that took a

shot at me for accurately saying it would cost people thousands of dollars if they were at 133 percent of the poverty level, that they'd have to buy the insurance or pay the extra income tax.

When you get down to it, even their article that criticized me pointed out at the end that still, with all of the government subsidies, it was still going to cost a few thousand dollars. That was the estimate. It's costing people money they don't have. They're getting less care, not more. And I don't have to just give opinion on that. We've got case after case, email after email from real Americans that have seen the harm it's done.

A young friend that I have tremendous respect for across the aisle pointed out, from his limited experience, that Congress has worked in a very partisan way the last few years. What he doesn't realize is that in the 4 years the Democrats controlled the House, they presided over the Congress that had more closed bills—that meant they didn't allow a single amendment. They ostracized nearly half of the country from being represented because they did not allow a single amendment to more bills than any other Congress in the history of our country. It was the most ruthless, partisan, overreaching Congress in the history of the country. It was unbelievable.

So it gets a little difficult to hear leaders who were in charge during the four most oppressive partisan years when it comes to having input from the other side tell us about responsibility and bipartisanship when they showed what they think when they were in charge. It was really quite mean.

We were told by our colleague earlier that Republicans gave us sequester. I encourage my friends across the aisle to go back and look at accurate history. It was the President who proposed sequester. I didn't think it was a good idea at all. That's no way to really legislate. We should have made the difficult choices and made the cuts. Then to hear comments that the Democrats believe freedom has made us great, I absolutely do, too. But freedom has a price. Freedom requires responsibility from Americans. It requires that everybody be involved, that everybody pay attention to what the government is doing.

So for those who have said for so long, I don't care what the government does as long as they stay out of my business, if that's your approach, the government does not and will not stay out of your business. It gets to where we are right now with ObamaCare. Every American's most private secrets about their own personal and private health will be kept by the Federal bureaucracy headquartered in Washington. The records may be kept elsewhere. I think the administration made a deal with GE. So GE and the Federal Government will have everyone's most personal secrets. It's a good thing they can keep a secret in the Federal Government so that nobody's

personal records will be leaked out once they get into the possession of GE or the Federal Government.

But for my friends across the aisle to talk about hostage politics, all I know is that people that I talk to across my district—I think the lowest denominator probably ended up at 500 to four that gave examples or talked about how bad ObamaCare was. You'd have a few people that said, Well, actually, we got our 26-year-old on our health insurance, so it's not so bad. Gee, the Republicans were ready to agree to that. We were ready to do bipartisan bills, but the most closed-minded and closed Congress in our history would not allow input. They didn't want our input. They were going to do it all themselves. As a result of that kind of mean-spiritedness, Americans are suffering today.

I have my friend from Texas, also a former State district judge. As I understand, he has heard from his constituents, as well. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. POE of Texas. I appreciate the gentleman yielding some time.

Earlier this morning, I was reading some emails and Facebook posts on my Facebook from people with the question that I asked: How does ObamaCare affect you? We ran out of time earlier this morning. Unlike the Senate, we can't talk until we're through talking, as you know.

I'm going to read a few more of those in the next few minutes from some of these folks that I received comments from in my district and people on Facebook this morning.

Tonya told me:

My family's insurance premiums have tripled since ObamaCare was signed into law. I'm not sure how much longer I will be able to keep it.

Pam says:

The huge chemical plant my husband works for has made changes to his benefits package, which include higher deductibles, co-pays, and loss of some prescription drug benefits—all done in the anticipation and implementation of the health care act. He works hard, I am a public school teacher, and we want to send our daughter to her dream school upon graduation this year: the University of Texas.

Mr. GOHMERT and I may have a disagreement on that. Anyway, they want to send their daughter to the University of Texas, and she continues:

More coming out of our pockets for health insurance means less available for college. Please help.

Shannon says that because of ObamaCare:

Premium doubled, all co-pays went up. So I had to change employers because of the law.

Brandy:

I am the finance manager for a non-profit company with 16 employees. We may not be able to offer health insurance next year.

Linda, who I went to high school with said:

I'm feeling the pain of ObamaCare today. My doctor's office told me this morning that

my insurance company will no longer, they have in the past, cover a procedure for my knee. I will now have to pay \$1,080 out of pocket.

Asked if this was a result of ObamaCare, she replied in the positive.

Also, TRICARE won't cover it and my doctor dropped Medicare coverage. Expensive.

Matthew says, I'm an outlaw now. I'm a subcontractor, and I just can't afford ObamaCare.

Kristin:

If I could afford insurance, I would already have it. This forces me to buy something I can't afford.

Jenn says this:

Deductible went up, co-pay went up, I have thyroid problems and have to have it tested one to two times a year. Insurance always covered the test. No longer covers it. I'm still trying to figure out the "affordable" part of the health care when my costs keep getting higher.

Here's what Kristy says about her family business:

Family business has had a 47 percent increase in cost to company since ObamaCare was passed. Will have to cut somewhere.

David:

I am a U.S./Texas citizen living in Bahrain/residence in Bahrain. My employer provides my insurance in Bahrain. I am told I have to buy a U.S. policy or pay a penalty.

And Teddy, the last one, presents a rough situation for people he cares about:

My fiancé went from 40-plus hours a week to 27 hours because her employer said they had to in order to avoid penalties from ObamaCare. My sister has been told that her test and some of the medicines for her MS will not be covered because ObamaCare mandates say she is no longer going to be a "viable" person at the age of 50.

These are real people who have contacted me today about the effects of ObamaCare. Contrary to what the folks on the other side have said for the last hour, it's not all great for a lot of Americans. It's a tough piece of legislation. It affects people's health. It affects them financially. This law turns over America's health to the Federal Government. There's got to be a better way.

I appreciate the gentleman from Tyler yielding me some time.

□ 1330

Mr. GOHMERT. Reclaiming my time, real people being hurt in real ways is what ObamaCare is doing. And for those who think it is a good thing, those were people that would have been helped by either side of the aisle.

But it should be noted that insurance companies, under ObamaCare, are paying an additional tax to the Federal Government. Everybody is having to pay more for everything, and yet they're getting less health care.

I get questions: Why, under ObamaCare, are we now going to see everything—we've already gotten notice, it's so much more expensive, and yet we're getting less coverage, less health care, higher deductibles, those kinds of things.

Part of that answer is, well, we've got to pay for the 18,000 or so IRS

agents who are going to be hired to help you with your health insurance so they can monitor more closely what you make and what you spend it on and whether you are spending enough on health care and how you are spending it. But we've got to pay for all the IRS agents. Now, that's not going to help anybody's health.

But then you also look at all the navigators that are being hired, and that's a problem. I saw over \$1 billion was about to be spent on advertising to tell Americans how good they were going to feel under ObamaCare. All of those things end up coming out of the coverage and the health care that people would otherwise get.

I see my friend from Pennsylvania has arrived, and I yield to him at this time.

Mr. PERRY. I would like to thank the gentleman from Tyler, Texas, for yielding to me.

I would just like to talk about what many Americans hear talked about in Congress but maybe can't put a face or a name to, and that is access to care. What does that mean, "access to care"? And our claim is that ObamaCare reduces access to care. "Access to care" is your ability to have a doctor take care of you or some kind of practitioner take care of whatever your health care need is. I think it's important that we show examples of that.

So, as of right now, on January 1, thousands of Americans are at risk of losing their lifesaving dialysis treatments which they need to survive. We're not talking about, I need to have my bunions reconfigured. We're not talking about, I've got a skin tag or I have an upset stomach. We're talking about dialysis. People who are on dialysis must have it on a regular basis to live.

I visited a dialysis clinic with 25 machines that operate 6 days a week in the Fourth Congressional District. Mr. Speaker, 6 days a week, 25 machines, all day long people come in, and it serves primarily the underprivileged population of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, which is the capital. That's its primary clientele. And the gal there that was running the place told me that on January 1, if ObamaCare continues to go through, they will cut their operating hours from 6 days to 3, 3 days a week from 6. So those 25 machines will be idle half the time that they're currently being used. That's 50 percent.

Now, Medicare payments already fall very short of covering the entire cost of this, but this clinic makes up the difference by the other paying customers. And I would ask the folks that support ObamaCare, do they really think that the rich in this Nation are going to go without access to care? We've heard about concierge medicine. The rich are going to continue to receive care one way or another. But it's the poor, it's really the abject poor that are going to suffer under this.

I just want to put some names to this. I met a Vietnam veteran named Johnny. You know, people think, Oh, if you have dialysis, you've got diabetes. You didn't take care of yourself. This man is fit, doesn't smoke, and does take care of himself, but he just happens to have diabetes. And he comes into this clinic, and he needs to come in more than once a week. So when you go from 6 days to 3 days, Johnny is going to have to look for some other way to get his dialysis.

And then there's Amy. Amy comes in a couple times a week and hooks herself up. She comes and knows it so well that the people there that are actually administering the service and the care don't have to do that work for her. She comes in and takes care of that herself so she can literally stay alive.

And then there's Chris, 34. People think, Oh, if you need dialysis, you didn't take care of yourself. You are an old person who didn't take care of yourself. Chris is 34 years old. When you go to dialysis, it's 4, 5 hours, sometimes, and more in the chair. That's a day away from work, away from family. And it's hard to sustain employment when you are gone 4 or 5 hours a day, two or three times a week to stay alive. But that's what these people must do. Chris supports himself. He is a chef in a local restaurant. He has got type 1. He's had kidney failure. So he's going to have to find another place to get his dialysis, because this place will no longer be there.

So that's what "access to care" means, and that's putting a face and a name to it; and that's what ObamaCare is going to do in the community that I represent, literally taking this life-saving care away from people.

I would urge my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to really take a look at the upcoming votes both in the Senate and in the House regarding this bill, regarding this law. It is not ready to roll out. There are significant failures of it and shortcomings. We understand it was laudable trying to find a way for every American to receive care. That is a laudable goal, and we support that.

We have a plan here in the House of Representatives. We would like the plan to be aired, but none of that is going to happen. None of that is going to happen if ObamaCare is fully implemented as is planned for in the upcoming days. None of that is going to happen. And these people that are receiving their dialysis on the west shore in the Fourth District of Pennsylvania are going to have to find some other way, literally day by day, to stay alive thanks to ObamaCare.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank the gentleman.

The gentleman is absolutely correct. But it's not just Pennsylvania, and it's not just Texas. It's everywhere. People are hurting.

My friends across the aisle in the last hour had commented about Republicans wanting a shutdown. We don't want a shutdown. We don't. TED CRUZ

does not want a shutdown. I visited with him quite a bit yesterday. He doesn't want a shutdown. But we know the damage ObamaCare is doing not just to the economy—that's bad enough—but to people's health.

Here is an email. We've gotten so many of them. Just in the short time I have, I'm trying to decide which ones to present. This one from Kaytee says:

Just got notice my health care coverage options and costs will be changed. They will send out the info next month. I am one of the 26,000 part-time Home Depot employees whose hours were cut back to never exceed 29 per week. We used to do the 6-week thing. They would schedule us for 35 to 39 hours per week for 5 weeks, then cut us back in the 6th week to 25 or so and then back up again. Now it's always going to be less than 29 hours per week. I'm scared to death to see what the rate changes will be. Probably way more than I make.

My doctor of 9 years is retiring this month. She is only 46 and an amazingly exceptional family medicine practitioner. Says she'll grow a garden and herd goats, but she won't be a contributing member of the insanity. She is an Indian Hindu born and raised in Canada. She came to Texas because of the messed up state-run medical care in Canada.

Insurance not the same, losing the doctor.

Here is one from Sandric:

My wife has a bone disease and is always in severe pain. We see a specialist in Longview, Texas. This specialist travels from Dallas, 110 miles away, and practices here a couple of days a week. But since ObamaCare, he has said that he can no longer afford to have two practices so far apart and will have to close his Longview practice and that he may just retire early. Now there will soon be no doctor in this area for my wife to see, and she is too debilitated to make the drive to Dallas every month. We are not sure what to do now.

These are real Americans agonizing over the damage that ObamaCare is doing. And I can't bring myself to call it the Affordable Care Act, because it isn't.

Here is one from a widow that lives in east Texas, Joy. She says:

I am losing my insurance, which I have had for over 30 years.

So much for, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it." There's no telling how many millions of times that promise will be broken in the subsequent months if we can't put off the damage ObamaCare is doing.

Back to her letter. Talking about the insurance, it says:

It was in my husband's name, and he has recently died. So here I am, a widow and losing my insurance. I am frustrated and a little scared. I've never had to do anything like research for insurance and don't even know where to begin. I am from Tyler, Texas, and saw your post on Facebook. Enclosed is the letter my insurance company sent me. They do not directly say it is due to ObamaCare, but it's pretty easy to read between the lines.

And actually, you don't even have to do much reading between the lines. She enclosed a copy of the letter from New York Life Insurance. At the end of the first paragraph, it says that their insurance, their Group Health and Life

Insurance Trust will terminate at midnight on December 31, 2013.

The decision to exit this market was not an easy one. The determination was made based on the evolving market conditions and regulatory requirements stemming from the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

I think that's pretty clear. She lost her insurance because of ObamaCare.

I know that there's nobody on the Democratic side that really wants to do this, put this kind of fear and suffering into a dear widow, but it's being done. I know that nobody voted on this side of the aisle for ObamaCare intending to hurt widows and children like is happening, but it's happening. And now that it's happening, it is absolutely incorrigible if my friends do not help us help those that are being hurt by at least postponing this disastrous, hurtful ObamaCare.

Here's another from Jay:

On Tuesday of last week, my 89-year-old mother-in-law fell and broke her hip. Her doctor gave her only a 50 percent chance of survival, but survive she did. He stated after the operation that she was lucky that it happened this week. He said, "In 2 weeks, I could not have performed the same procedure because it is not an approved procedure under the new rules. It's too expensive." We all wondered what her chances of survival would have been under Dr. Obama.

She will have insurance, but we're already hearing from people that they've been told they'd better get the procedure now because, if they wait, it's not going to be covered because the ObamaCare board apparently thinks if you are of a certain age then maybe you don't need or deserve a pacemaker or back surgery.

Here's another:

I work for a commercial electrical contractor who has been in business in east Texas for over 30 years. At the beginning of this year, we employed over 100 workers. The company provides group health insurance and pays 75 percent of the cost for the employees. At this time, we have 66 employees. We will intentionally have less than 50 employees by the end of the year, and the owner is planning to drop the health plan at the first of the coming year.

So much for, "If you like your insurance, you can keep it." Not only are you not going to keep your insurance, you are not keeping your employment.

Here is another from Bobbye: With the health mandate looming, the college where he teaches "determined that adjunct professors could no longer teach four classes per semester because the time for prep/teaching would require they provide me health insurance." So he has been dropped from the class maximum to three. He said: I didn't expect health insurance from the college, but the mandate has now dictated my workload.

It dictated less work. So how does he make it?

Here's one:

I am a 56-year-old single woman with no children, and I have been stuck as part-time toll collector for Harris County, Texas, since the passage of ObamaCare. For 4 years, I only work 72 hours every 2 weeks, with no benefits whatsoever. Last year, the County

Commissioner stated they will no longer hire full-time employees. I have \$39 left for groceries once mortgage payment and bills are paid. ObamaCare will destroy me.

□ 1345

Here's another, from Charles:

I recently applied for a job in Tyler at a new restaurant. At my interview, I asked how many hours I could expect. The owner said, verbatim: I'm sorry but because of ObamaCare I cannot afford to hire anyone for more than 30 hours per week.

Here's another, from Timothy:

I am the only one that works in my house. I support a family of five and would be considered lower middle class. I just received notice from my employer that I now have to pay an additional \$6 per person per month as a surcharge on the new health care law. Also, my premium is going up \$60 per month. It's a total of \$100 per month, or increase of about \$1,200 per year. I am basically looking at a 34 percent increase for nothing. I don't know how I'm going to be able to afford this as my budget is pretty tight already. Repeal the Affordable Health Care Act, please, because for me, it's anything but affordable.

Here's another, from Rose:

I'm 54 years old and have always had health insurance, which I pay for myself. I too received a letter telling me that, due to this so-called affordable health care, they will not be providing me with continued insurance. I will need to make decisions about what insurance I want, but they have no idea what choices I will have and of course, no idea what I will be charged, but were quick to say it will likely be more than I pay now. Thanks a lot, ObamaCare.

We have no extra income to pay for this. Please stop this from happening to our family and families throughout our country who are having their rights taken away from us.

Here's one from Andrea. She sells insurance for State Farm. They partner with Assurant Health for our individual medical plans:

Ever since we were forced this monstrosity in the most partisan vote ever, we have seen major changes come from the health insurance policies we were able to offer. Not only is there a noticeable increase in the price, we no longer offer maternity coverage, we no longer offer prescription copay, we no longer offer an office copay, we no longer offer the low deductibles we once did.

We have lost many of the networks that allowed people in our area the best choice as their doctor being in network. Now, the premium increases at the renewal are much higher than pre-reforms.

Here's another, from Melissa:

I am self-employed, and I'm already paying for my own health insurance. I received a letter from my insurance provider 3 weeks ago that stated there would be changes in my policy and they would be sending me additional information in the coming months. Based on the estimates I've seen, my monthly insurance costs will go up roughly 136 percent.

ObamaCare is damaging real Americans. We owe it to them to do everything we can to stop it, and stop the waivers and exemptions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HOW WE GOT HERE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2013, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) for 30 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it's my privilege and honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives, especially at this time, as the House and the Senate hurtle towards some type of perhaps collision and sometimes perhaps a conclusion to the drama that's taking place over the funding of our government. And it seems as though the focus of all this comes down on ObamaCare.

But I'd like to first, Mr. Speaker, paint the picture on how we got here. And it's this: the House has consistently passed a budget, and then, the House-passed legislation, essentially, required the Senate to finally, after over 1,000 days, pass a budget over there themselves.

Of course it was a token and, of course it was pushed off to the side and, of course it wasn't something that could be reconciled with a responsible, legitimate budget here in the House of Representatives. But it met the criterion narrowly.

So the functionality of this Congress, which has been in the past, 12 or so appropriations bills passing here, starting here, being messaged over to the Senate where, when things worked right, the Senate picked up those appropriations bills and, through their appropriations process, their hearings, their deliberation, their subcommittee and their committee process, worked their will with the House bill that had been messaged to them.

And one at a time, 12 or 13 appropriation bills would work their way so that they had passed the House in one form and, generally, the Senate in a different form, in which case, a conference committee would be appointed, and House Republicans and Democrats would sit down with Senate Republicans and Democrats, hammer out the differences in one of 12 or 13 appropriation bills, and come to an agreement, send the conference report to the House or the Senate, for passage, in which case it would pass both, be messaged to the President. That appropriation, then, would be concluded and fulfilled.

A responsible government starts with hearing from our constituents, in November, December and January, as we look forward to the end of the fiscal year, which happens next Monday night at midnight—we're working towards getting all of our government funded appropriately.

And in those months of January, it starts up, and then in February and March, the intensity of hearing from constituents and their budgetary concerns, the appropriations hearings in the Appropriations Committee, and then here on the floor under an open rule, bill after bill after bill, a dozen appropriation bills are debated, and the open rule that allows amendments to be brought forward on that to adjust

the appropriations up or down, or perhaps transfer some of those appropriations, and the House work its will, the Senate work its will.

We come together and agree on a conference report. We send it to the President. The President signs it, and those departments of government that are funded by that appropriation bill then are given their budgetary responsibility and their spending authority for the upcoming fiscal year.

That's how it has worked in the past. It does not work that way under this dysfunctional setup that exists today.

What happens now in this Congress that we have, Mr. Speaker, is this: the House debates the appropriations bills, 12 of them or so. We have passed several of them at this point in the House. We've sent them over to the Senate.

They go, messaged to the Senate, where they arrive at the Majority Leader HARRY REID's desk. And figuratively speaking, HARRY REID then puts that appropriation bill in his desk drawer and closes the drawer, not to be discussed or heard from again for the balance of the fiscal year. And another appropriation bill goes and another and another and another.

And what you see happen is, we've seen this happen in the past, where we have passed, I remember, under Chairman Jerry Lewis, the Appropriations chair at the time, all of our appropriation bills by July. Messaged them all over to the Senate, where they all would go in HARRY REID's desk drawer.

At the end of the fiscal year, some time about now, or maybe a week ahead of this time, HARRY REID would look around and think, oh, we're facing a government shutdown if I don't get those bills out of my desk drawer.

And so he pulls out a dozen appropriations bills. Each one of them is a collective judgment of the majority of the United States House of Representatives, constitutionally messaged to the Senate, stacks them up and takes his little marker through there, and he draws a line through the appropriations that he doesn't like, and he writes in all of the line items and puts on all the Christmas tree spending that he does like, and he puts in the wish list of the Senators that he wants to help out, so to speak, and some are Republicans and many are Democrats.

He creates this omnibus spending bill. Sometimes we call it omnibus if it doesn't show up at the end of the year. Otherwise, if it's at the expiration of our spending of our appropriations, as it is now, we call it a continuing resolution.

We've been operating on continuing resolutions for too long. And it isn't because of ObamaCare, necessarily, that we're at this point today. The leverage has been created because HARRY REID didn't deal with our appropriations bills.

And furthermore, he's not going to deal with our appropriation bills. He is going to create this crisis so that it increases the leverage that he has in defeating the will of the people, which is

to shut off all of the funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, to put an end to its implementation, to not let ObamaCare become implemented, because—

First of all, I don't agree with the decision made by the Supreme Court. I think it's completely inconsistent to declare a bill to be a tax as it arrives at the United States Supreme Court—excuse me—to declare it not to be a tax as it arrives at the Supreme Court for the purposes of considering the issue of the litigation on ObamaCare, but then to declare it to be a tax as a decision of the Supreme Court.

It can be one or the other. Either ObamaCare is a tax or it's not a tax, but it can't be conveniently not a tax for the purposes of whether the Supreme Court would grant cert, and then conveniently, a tax for the purposes of declaring that it is constitutional. But that's the decisions that were made by the United States Supreme Court.

All of us take an oath to uphold the Constitution, everyone in the House and the Senate and, of course, the Supreme Court as well. And we can't be taking an oath to uphold a decision that no one that I know of in America predicted.

You would think, Mr. Speaker, that of all the constitutional scholars we have that had been writing and reading and thinking and analyzing ObamaCare, that had watched as, by legislative shenanigans, hook and crook, that patchwork of ObamaCare had been jammed through the House and the Senate in a fashion that would not have mirrored any process we had ever seen before, they'd seen the time that the Senate had a filibuster-proof majority.

And I remember going into Christmas Eve, the vote that was taking place over there on the 24th of December, on Christmas Eve, and I remember when the Senate had the ability to delay that vote from 9 in the morning on Christmas Eve morning, December 24, till 9 that night, which truly would have been Christmas Eve.

And I sent the message over there to my Senator and I said, please delay that vote as long as you can. Keep that thing delayed until the last possible minute. If they want to jam this country and give us a Christmas present of ObamaCare so badly that they will sit there on Christmas Eve, keep them there then, and let them miss Christmas with their families because the flights will be gone out of Dulles by then. That's what I asked to happen.

There was a negotiation that took place, allowed an agreement from Republicans that there'd be a couple of votes in January that they wanted on some taxes or something of that nature. So they had a vote at 9:00 in the morning, December 24, that allowed for ObamaCare to move ahead one more time.

And then I wrote back to my Senator, and I said, what do we do now?

And his answer was pray, and pray for a Republican victory in the United States Senate race in Massachusetts, the special election because of the passing of Senator Teddy Kennedy.

None of us thought on December 24, that year, that the following January 18 or 19th—that's very close to the election date—that Scott Brown would be elected as a United States Senator out of Massachusetts.

That is what happened. That was the people in Massachusetts rising up and saying, we don't want ObamaCare. We reject ObamaCare. We'll even go so far as that entirely blue State of Massachusetts, that had a delegation of eight Members of Congress, every single one of them a Democrat, and none of them known as conservative Democrats by the measure that I know.

That's Massachusetts, and they sent us Scott Brown. And they're the ones that had the most example with something that looked like a preview, perhaps, of ObamaCare.

So who knew more than the Bay Staters about this?

Who had the most loaded politics that should have been electing a Democrat in that election?

No, they said, we don't want to see anything that looks like ObamaCare, and we're going to send you a young, fresh Republican whose job it is to help kill ObamaCare. And he came here and began to engage in that effort, and was significant in his role. My hat's off to former Senator Scott Brown.

But, in the end, legislative shenanigans defeated even the voters in Massachusetts' will, and they put legislation through back over from the Senate under that process they call reconciliation. They carved out some, put it into the reconciliation process to avoid the filibuster because they no longer had a filibuster-proof majority. The people had spoken. And then the legislative shenanigans began.

While that was going on, there was a drama here in the House. Now that takes us to March of that year. And the drama in the House was that there were the "Stupak Dozen" who said, I'm not going to vote for an ObamaCare piece of legislation that will fund abortion.

So the President made an offer—this is what's reported in the news at least, Mr. Speaker—that he would write an Executive order that would nullify the Stupak amendment, or nullify the ban on funding abortion. And that promise was made by the President before ObamaCare was passed in order to get the votes to get ObamaCare to pass here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

□ 1400

The President of the United States, a former adjunct professor of constitutional law at the University of Chicago, made a promise to a Democrat Congressman from Michigan, who, presumably, controlled 12 votes of the unnamed "Stupak dozen," who were

anonymous, oddly. It's hard to think you're going to control votes if nobody knows who they are.

In any case, the President made a promise that he would sign an Executive order that would nullify some of the language that's in the law. Congressman Stupak took that promise and the former adjunct law professor, President Obama, made a promise that said that the President thought that he could amend law after he signed it into law. Now what constitutional professor would take a position like that?

I dig this up for a little bit, Mr. Speaker, because I want people to understand this piece of ObamaCare legislation is not the will of the people. It never was the will of the people. It's the product of hook and crook and legislative shenanigans. It's done against the will of the people.

And furthermore, Thomas Jefferson, whom both parties revere, once said:

Large initiatives should not be advanced on slender majorities.

Large initiatives need to be bipartisan initiatives, not completely 100 percent partisan initiatives, which ObamaCare is. And the slender majority that Thomas Jefferson was talking about was a slender majority that he presumed to be a bipartisan majority. If Jefferson had been talking about a partisan majority, it would have been very clear, in my opinion, what he would have said. He would have said that large initiatives should never be advanced on partisan majorities. That's what happened with ObamaCare.

The largest initiative that has been jammed down the throats of the American people in its entire history is ObamaCare, advanced on a purely partisan majority by utilization of legislative shenanigans and hook and crook. That's what got us to this point.

People wonder, Why don't you just throw up your hands, why don't you accept reality? ObamaCare is the law of the land. Let it be. Fund it. Because the people have spoken.

Well, the people had spoken. They spoke when they elected Scott Brown. And in the aftermath of the passage of ObamaCare about March 20 or 21, 2010, the people spoke again that following November. And I remember when ObamaCare passed in the night. I had been battling this thing for days, and I went home about 1:30 or 2 o'clock in the morning, maybe a little later than that, but it was when the business wound down here in the House, Mr. Speaker, and I went home and I thought, I'm going to lay down and I'm going to sleep the sleep of the exhausted. And I'm going to get completely rested up, and I'm going to wake up in the morning and then I'm going to put a plan together on what we do now. Because I knew that the bill was messaged to the White House, and I knew the President was salivating to sign it. Well, he did that within about 48 hours.

I woke up, though, in about 2½ hours because the wheels were turning and I

couldn't take it any longer. And I drafted the language to repeal ObamaCare. I had that formal request to get that bill handed back to me by the draft people we have here when the door opened at 9 o'clock that morning.

We've been doing battle with ObamaCare ever since. Not only me, but the gentlelady from Minnesota that was down here and led an hour Special Order earlier today has been standing in there. And she ran for President on the issue, MICHELE BACHMANN. No one wondered what she would do if she were elected President. She would have repealed ObamaCare. LOUIE GOHMERT has been putting in hour after hour here on the floor and around this country, doing battle with ObamaCare.

The list of people that deserve credit for stepping up to this fight is long. And it isn't exclusive here in the House, Mr. Speaker. It includes a group of stalwarts in the Senate, led in this latest episode by Senator TED CRUZ of Texas, who stood on the floor for more than 21 hours and delivered a whole series of arguments against ObamaCare.

But I'll say here's the argument that is at the center of ObamaCare, Mr. Speaker, and it is this: ObamaCare is, by my opinion, an unconstitutional taking of God-given American liberty. It takes away our right to manage our health. The most sovereign thing that we have as an American people is our soul. And the eternal nature of our soul is controlled by God and our will. This Federal Government hasn't figured out how to nationalize our soul.

But the second most sovereign thing we have is our bodies, our health, our skin, and everything inside it. It's the second most sovereign thing that we have. And the Federal Government, under ObamaCare, has figured out how to nationalize our skin and everything inside it.

It's a Federal Government takeover of the management of our health where, under ObamaCare, if you walk into a clinic, if you walk into an emergency room, if you apply for government-approved insurance under whatever means that might emerge, when no one really can tell us at this point, the government decides whether you get the insurance, the government decides whether you get a subsidy for the premium, the government decides what kind of research gets done, what kind of treatment one gets.

The government decides if you are worth the hip replacement or the knee replacement or whether you get just painkillers for as long as you can live with a broken hip. The government decides that, not us any longer. We understand that, those of us that have a little bit of gray hair, or maybe have lost some. We understand that. But do the children in our grade schools and in nurseries today understand that?

Mr. Speaker, we know that answer is no. They don't understand that. When these children grow up and they get out of school and they step into adult-

hood and they have already been brought up under a system of ObamaCare that makes these decisions for them, what happens to their dreams, what happens to their aspirations, what happens to their ability to think big? What happens to their ability to manage their life?

The institutional memory will disappear of the culture and civilization that remembers the glorious time when we could choose our doctor, when the market demand created the insurance policies that suit us, the consumers, when we could shop from doctor to doctor, from clinic to clinic, when we could say, But you know, I want this care for my mother this badly that I think even though she is 85, she needs a hip replacement. Because I don't want to see her die in a wheelchair. That's a different world than we have today.

Mr. Speaker, we've just gotten messaged to us on the CR—the continuing resolution—from the United States Senate, that the vote had concluded over on the other side, down on the other end, through the Rotunda. The Senate has now acted to peel out the ban on funding for ObamaCare and send us back what they would call a clean CR with their changes and provisions, which would include a continuing resolution up until November 15. So it is a shorter-term CR than we offered to them.

But what it says is, We as Senators are not going to let you prohibit the funding of ObamaCare. So, again, we're back to the center and the crux of this. Another dramatic event has taken place here in the United States Capitol. And the drama of this now is in the lap of the House of Representatives, where our Speaker has just received the message of H.J. Res. 59, the CR.

Now we have a decision to make. My message, Mr. Speaker, is this: if 218 House Members hold our ground, if we say we will not fund ObamaCare and we will not fund an appropriation that fails to cut off the funding to ObamaCare, if we hold our ground, we will win.

This contest now that's going on in is a contest of wills. There's a relatively narrow majority in the Senate. There's a little bit broader majority in the House, I believe. And the strength of will is being measured. This is like holding a gun on each other now, standing in a burning building, and deciding who's going to blink. But we can't just let down the hammer and stand there because the building is burning. Somebody's got to walk away from this confrontation and say, I'm going to give you your way.

Well, my message to this, Mr. Speaker, is that we've heard this message over and over again: if there is a government shutdown, House Republicans will always lose in a confrontation with the President. I don't know that that's true. And I don't know if it was even true in 1995 and 1996, when there was a government shutdown that lasted for 21 days.

What I do know is this House sent the funding to keep our government open over to the Senate. With it was language that said there would be no funding to implement or enforce ObamaCare. It happens that's language I wrote and presented here in this Congress in February of 2011.

We have said we want this government to stay open. We want to avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown, avoid a shutdown. If we repeat that enough times, it might be sending a message to the Senators that we really don't mean it when we say that we're not going to fund ObamaCare.

I want to send the message, Mr. Speaker, that we do mean it. And I want to send the message that we're going to hold our ground. And I'd like to remind, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a whole series of shutdowns throughout history. And I have a list of them printed here. There were at least five government shutdowns when Jimmy Carter was President. Five of them. Five incidents. One of them was over a nuclear ship of some kind. The longest shutdown he had was 18 days. Does anybody remember those shutdowns from the eighties? Kind of. It didn't change my life, that I remember.

But that was Democrats in majority in the House and the Senate and a Democrat President. Their infighting caused government shutdowns for a total of 57 days—57 days between 1977 and 1981. And sometimes Jimmy Carter won, sometimes the Democrats in the House and Senate prevailed over the President of the United States. All the same party.

So if we don't remember the price paid for a government shutdown, if the inconvenience of it doesn't linger in anybody's memory, I take you to the era of Ronald Reagan, when there were a number of shutdowns under Ronald Reagan—fewer and for a shorter period of time. One of them was over a billion dollars in social spending. Of that billion dollars, the government was shut down for about 3 days. In that period of time, by the way, there was a Republican majority in the United States Senate and we had a principled Republican President, Democrats in the majority here in the House. The Democrats refused to agree with the President and the Senate. It resulted in a government shutdown.

In that shutdown that lasted—in the end, the \$1 billion in spending that Democrats here wanted was negotiated down to \$900 million dollars. They gave up 10 percent of what they asked for and the government was opened back up again.

So a determined majority in the House of Representatives prevailed to the level of 90 percent of their ask against a Republican majority in the Senate that opposed them and a President who has clearly held his ground in case after case.

It isn't clear who prevails in an issue like this, but I'll say this: the American people will judge our resolve and

our determination. And the determination on who wins and who loses, if that actually matters, will be written by history.

But I say this, Mr. Speaker. If we hold our ground, I believe there will not be a political price for House Republicans to pay. When House Republicans held their ground and eventually caved in 1995 and 1996, some say House Republicans lost that. They lost eight seats in the following election. They did not lose the majority. Six of those eight seats were marginal seats they were likely to lose anyway. So perhaps they lost two congressional seats.

If we don't want to put at risk two congressional seats out of the House Republican majority to stand on the principle that cuts off all funding to implement and enforce ObamaCare, is our fear for our political jobs greater than our love of principle and the people we represent?

I would argue instead that there will not be political consequences for standing on principle and refusing to fund ObamaCare. If there are political consequences, they will be recovered from over time.

□ 1415

But we, Mr. Speaker, can never recover from ObamaCare if it's implemented and enforced. That is the bottom line.

No political consequences will be delivered to the people who stand up for the American people. That's the House Republican stance. That's the Senate conservative stance—that came a little short over here a few minutes ago down the other side of the Capitol. But if we stand together as House Republicans, as Senate Republicans, as principled people who look back at that time and saw that Scott Brown came to the United States Senate because the blue State Massachusetts rejected ObamaCare.

There was a wave election in 2010 that elected 87 new House Republicans—every one of them ran on repeal of ObamaCare. Every Republican in the House and Senate has voted multiple times to undue, repeal, unfund and defund ObamaCare. All of us stand together—it was bipartisan the last time. We had two Democrats that also agreed with us on this CR.

We must stand on principle. If there's a political price to be paid for standing on principle, I say it's worth it. We can recover from any political price, even though I don't believe there will be anything but a political reward; but we can never recover if we allow ObamaCare to be implemented or enforced.

That's my stand, Mr. Speaker. That's the stand that I ask my colleagues to take today, tomorrow, the next day, and every day. If we hold together and we hold strong, in the end the beneficiaries will be the American people and God-given liberty.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. (Ms.), one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 59. Joint Resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1348. An act to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act; to the Committee on Education and the workforce.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1412. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend certain expiring authorities affecting veterans and their families, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, September 28, 2013, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3118. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule — Program Integrity Issues [Docket ID: ED-2010-OPE-0004] (RIN: 1840-AD02) received September 18, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

3119. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — 2,5-Furandione, Polymer with Ethynylbenzene, Hydrolyzed, 3-(Dimethylamino)propyl Imide, Imide with Polyethylene-Polypropylene Glycol 2-Aminopropyl Me Ether, 2,2'-(1,2-Diazenediyl)bis[2-Methyl utanenitrile]-Initiated; Tolerance Exemption [EPA-HQ-OPP-2013-0383; FRL-9398-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3120. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Regional Haze [EPA-R01-OAR-2012-0025; A-1-FRL-9732-4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3121. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Cleveland-Akron-Lorain Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2011-0868; EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0463; FRL-9900-92, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3122. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Ohio; Redesignation of the Steubenville-Weirton Area to Attainment of the 1997 Annual Standard and the 2006 24-Hour Standard for Fine Particulate Matter [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0337 and EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0462; FRL-9900-79, Region 5] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3123. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado Second Ten-Year PM10 Maintenance Plan for Aspen [EPA-R08-OAR-2012-0475; FRL-9901-06, Region 8] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3124. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Amendments to Vehicle Inspection and Maintenance Program for Wisconsin [EPA-R05-OAR-2012-0465; FRL-9827-9] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3125. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; North Carolina; Removal of Stage II Gasoline Vapor Recovery Program [EPA-R04-OAR-2009-0140; FRL-9901-10, Region 4] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3126. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri; Conformity of General Federal Actions to State Implementation Plan [EPA-R07-OAR-2013-0511; FRL-9901-01, Region 7] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3127. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Puget Sound Clean Air Agency Regulatory Updates [EPA-R10-OAR-2013-0174; FRL-9901-03, Region 10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3128. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Chlorantraniliprole; Pesticide Tolerances [EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0635; FRL-9395-1] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3129. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communication Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modernizing the

FCC Form 477 Data Program [WC Docket No.: 11-10] received September 17, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3130. A letter from the Acting Senior Procurement Executive, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Documenting Contractor Performance [FAC 2005-69; FAR Case 2012-009; Item III; Docket 2012-0009, Sequence 1] (RIN: 9000-AM09) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3131. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Beechcraft Corporation and Hawker Beechcraft Corporation [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1180; Directorate Identifier 2012-CE-032-AD; Amendment 39-17539; AD 2013-16-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3132. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0639; Directorate Identifier 2013-SW-020-AD; Amendment 39-17518; AD 2013-15-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3133. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; CFM International, S.A. Turboprop Engines [Docket No.: FAA-2012-1114; Directorate Identifier 2012-NE-21-AD; Amendment 39-17511; AD 2013-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3134. A letter from the Assistant Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Hazardous Materials: Approval and Communication Requirements for the Safe Transportation of Air Bag Inflators, Air Bag Modules, and Seat-Belt Pretensioners (RRR) [Docket No.: PHMSA-2010-0201 (HM-254)] (RIN: 2137-AE62) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3135. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0297; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-205-AD; Amendment 39-17550; AD 2013-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3136. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0353; Directorate Identifier 2008-SW-029-AD; Amendment 39-17545; AD 2013-16-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 9, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3137. A letter from the Paralegal Specialist, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2013-0367; Directorate Identifier 2012-NM-177-AD; Amendment 39-17546; AD 2013-16-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 16, 2013, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 185. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 101 East Pecan Street in Sherman, Texas, as the "Paul Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 113-232). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 579. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 501 East Court Street in Jackson, Mississippi, as the "R. Jess Brown United States Courthouse" (Rept. 113-233). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2251. A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 118 South Mill Street, in Fergus Falls, Minnesota, as the "Edward J. Devitt United States Courthouse"; with an amendment (Rept. 113-234). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3096. A bill to designate the building occupied by the Federal Bureau of Investigation located at 801 Follin Lane, Vienna, Virginia, as the "Michael D. Resnick Terrorist Screening Center" (Rept. 113-235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Florida: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 2189. A bill to establish a commission or task force to evaluate the backlog of disability claims of the Department of Veterans Affairs; with amendments (Rept. 113-236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200. A bill to establish a fund to make payments to the Americans held hostage in Iran from 1979 through 1981, and to members of their families, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the National Coal Heritage Area Act of 1996 to reauthorize the Augusta Canal National Heritage Area; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H.R. 3202. A bill to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to prepare a comprehensive security assessment of the transportation security card program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203. A bill to provide the people of the United States with an opportunity to make gifts to the United States Government to be used for the purpose of providing public tours of the White House; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr.

MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LATTA, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. GRIFFITH of Virginia, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. MATHESON):

H.R. 3204. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to human drug compounding and drug supply chain security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. DOGGETT):

H.R. 3205. A bill to reauthorize and restructure the adoption incentives grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. CLARKE (for herself, Ms. BASS,

Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ENYART, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. LEE of California, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MORAN, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. BERA of California):

H.R. 3206. A bill to promote the sexual and reproductive health of individuals and couples in developing countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ (for himself, Ms.

BORDALLO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. ENYART, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLON, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mrs. BUSTOS):

H.R. 3207. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to modify the method of determining whether Filipino veterans are United States residents for purposes of eligibility for receipt of the full-dollar rate of compensation under the laws administered by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3208. A bill to clarify that certain natural gas facilities are not subject to the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. MEEHAN):

H.R. 3209. A bill to impose sanctions against persons who knowingly provide material support or resources to Boko Haram or its affiliates, associated groups, or agents, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. STUTZMAN, and Mr. SOUTHERLAND):

H.J. Res. 66. A joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2014, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FARENTHOLD:

H. Res. 362. A resolution expressing support for designation of September 26, 2014, as "National Pediatric Bone Cancer Awareness Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CÁRDENAS (for himself, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. SIREs, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mrs. NEGRETE MCLEOD, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. GALLEG0, Ms. CHU, Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PASTOR of Arizona):

H. Res. 363. A resolution recognizing Hispanic Heritage Month and celebrating the heritage and culture of Latinos in the United States and the immense contributions of Latinos to the United States; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. FATTAH:

H. Res. 364. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of "World Alzheimer's Month"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 365. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives commending efforts by the United States to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through a negotiated two-state solution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 3200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. BARROW of Georgia:

H.R. 3201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 3202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1, 3, and 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GRAYSON:

H.R. 3203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

"The Congress shall have Power To . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States . . ."

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17

"To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, but Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-yards and other needful Buildings;"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

"To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof."

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ."

By Mr. UPTON:

H.R. 3204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution. (Commerce Clause)

By Mr. CAMP:

H.R. 3205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution, to "provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States."

By Ms. CLARKE:

H.R. 3206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill, the Global Sexual and Reproductive Health Act, is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. GUTIÉRREZ:

H.R. 3207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress has the power to enact this legislation under Article I, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have power to enact this legislation to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10

By Mr. REED:

H.J. Res. 66.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 24: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 207: Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 419: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 447: Mr. BARLETTA.

H.R. 541: Mr. NEAL, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 647: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 732: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 765: Ms. SHEA-PORTER.

H.R. 792: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 901: Mr. GOSAR.

H.R. 920: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 940: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS.

H.R. 961: Mr. O'ROURKE and Ms. FUDGE.

H.R. 962: Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 975: Mr. GRAYSON and Mrs. BUSTOS.

H.R. 980: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 997: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1015: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1024: Mrs. BLACKBURN.

H.R. 1149: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 1150: Mr. HONDA.

H.R. 1209: Mr. NUGENT, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 1250: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1423: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 1461: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 1466: Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1518: Mr. VELA and Ms. DUCKWORTH.

H.R. 1553: Mr. TIPTON and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 1563: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1588: Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 1652: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 1690: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1731: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 1750: Mr. KLINE, Mr. CASSIDY, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 1755: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 1814: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. PERRY, and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 1851: Mr. BARROW of Georgia.

H.R. 1869: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.

H.R. 1884: Mr. PETERS of California.

H.R. 1920: Mr. BERA of California.

H.R. 2083: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 2238: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2247: Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mr. NUGENT, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 2309: Mr. UPTON, Ms. FOXX, and Mr. GIBSON.

H.R. 2310: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2328: Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 2366: Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. GUTHRIE.

H.R. 2478: Mr. COTTON and Mr. LONG.

H.R. 2500: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 2502: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2577: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2664: Mr. BUCSHON.

H.R. 2735: Mr. FARR.

H.R. 2785: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 2788: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2797: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 2809: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. POMPEO, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. GARDNER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. STOCKMAN.

H.R. 2823: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2839: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 2894: Mr. VALADAO.

H.R. 2901: Mr. COTTON and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 2988: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 3043: Mr. HECK of Washington.

H.R. 3077: Mr. GARDNER.

H.R. 3103: Mr. ROGERS of Michigan and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3108: Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3118: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.R. 3121: Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. MARINO, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BARTON, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3134: Mr. ENYART.

H.R. 3143: Mr. LOBIONDO.

H.R. 3166: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 3168: Mr. THORNBERRY and Mr. NEUGEBAUER.

H.R. 3170: Mr. FLORES, Mr. GIBBS, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.

H.R. 3183: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan.

H. Con. Res. 16: Mr. HANNA, Mr. YODER, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. DESJARLAIS, and Mr. VALADAO.

September 27, 2013

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H5923

H. Con. Res. 29: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H. Res. 30: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H. Res. 153: Mr. DESANTIS.

H. Res. 301: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. GRI-

JALVA, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN

SCHULTZ, Ms. MOORE, and Mr. TONKO.

H. Res. 327: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Ms. JENKINS.

H. Res. 356: Mr. REICHERT and Mr. LOEBSACK.